arXiv:1703.06335v1 [math.DS] 18 Mar 2017

INVARIANT MEASURES, MATCHING AND THE FREQUENCY OF 0 FOR SIGNED BINARY EXPANSIONS

KARMA DAJANI AND CHARLENE KALLE

Abstract. We introduce a parametrised family of maps S_α, called symmetric doubling maps, defined on $[-1,1]$ by $S_\alpha(x) = 2x - d\alpha$, where $d \in \{-1,0,1\}$ and $\alpha \in [1,2]$. Each map S_α generates binary expansions with digits -1,0 and 1. The transformations S_α have a natural invariant measure μ_α that is absolutely continuous with respect to Lebesgue measure. We show that for a set of parameters of full measure, the invariant measure of the symmetric doubling map is piecewise smooth. We also study the frequency of the digit 0 in typical expansions, as a function of the parameter α. In particular, we investigate the self similarity displayed by the function $\alpha \to \mu_\alpha([-1/2,1/2])$, where $\mu_\alpha([-1/2,1/2]$ denotes the measure of the cylinder where digit 0 occurs. This is done by exploiting a relation with another family of maps, namely the α-continued fraction maps.

1. Introduction

Matching is a phenomenon that occurs for certain interval maps and that has received quite a lot of attention recently. It is the property that for each critical point the orbits of the left and right limit meet after some finite number of steps and that the derivatives of both orbits are also equal at that time. If one considers matching for a family of interval maps depending on one parameter, then knowledge on when and how matching occurs can help to understand the invariant measure and the metric entropy of maps in this family.

Matching has been studied for several families of interval maps. In the case of Nakada or α-continued fractions ($\alpha \in [0,1]$), knowledge about intervals on which matching occurs led to a good description of the monotonicty of metric entropy as a function of α (see [NN08, CMPT10, CT12, KSS12, BCIT13, CT13] for example). In [KSS12] matching played a role in determining a natural extension for the α-continued fraction transformation. Kraaikamp, Schmidt and Steiner also obtained that the set of α's for which the transformation does not have matching has Lebesgue measure 0. In [CT12] it was shown that this set has Hausdorff dimension 1. In [DKS09] matching was used to determine the invariant measure of a related family of continued fraction transformations, namely for α-Rosen continued fraction transformations.

There is also some literature on matching for piecewise linear maps. In [BSORG13] a family of linear maps that have one increasing and one decreasing branch with different absolute value of the slope is considered. Botella-Soler et at. provided numerical evidence for the existence of parameter regions, related to matching, on which the Lyapunov exponent and topological entropy remain constant. A similar family is studied by Cosper and Misiurewicz ([CM]) who gave a geometric explanation for why matching occurs. This family and the relation between matching and smoothness of the invariant measure is also considered among other things in [BCMP]. In [BCK17] matching is considered for a family of generalised β-transformations, namely the family $x \mapsto \beta x + \alpha \pmod 1$. It is shown that for certain Pisot numbers β, the set of α's for which the map does not have matching has Hausdorff dimension strictly less than 1.

Date: Version of March 21, 2017.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 37E05, 28D05, 37E15, 37A45, 37A05.

Key words and phrases. doubling map, matching, interval map, invariant measure, digit frequency.

The second author was partially supported by the NWO Veni-grant 639.031.140.

In this article we are interested in matching for the following family of interval maps. Let $\alpha \in [1,2]$ and consider the transformation $S_\alpha : [-1,1] \to [-1,1]$ given by

$$S_\alpha(x) = \begin{cases} 2x+\alpha, & \text{if } -1 \le x < -\frac{1}{2}, \\ 2x, & \text{if } -\frac{1}{2} \le x \le \frac{1}{2}, \\ 2x-\alpha, & \text{if } \frac{1}{2} < x \le 1. \end{cases} \tag{1}$$

We call these maps *symmetric doubling maps*. Figure 1 shows the graph of S_α for various α's.



(a) $\alpha = 2$ (b) $\alpha = \sqrt{3}$ (c) $\alpha = \frac{3}{2}$

(d) $\alpha = \frac{4}{3}$ (e) $\alpha = \frac{6}{5}$ (f) $\alpha = 1$

FIGURE 1. The symmetric doubling map for various values of α. The red dotted lines indicate the orbits of 1 and $1-\alpha$.

For any $\alpha \in (1,2]$ the system has a unique absolutely continuous invariant measure μ_α that is ergodic. By [Kop90] the corresponding density function h_α is an infinite sum of indicator functions over intervals that have endpoints in the set

$$\{S_\alpha^n(1-\alpha), S_\alpha^n(1), S_\alpha^n(\alpha-1), S_\alpha^n(-1) \,:\, n \ge 0\}. \tag{2}$$

There are some situations in which this density becomes piecewise smooth. For example, when the orbits of 1 and $1-\alpha$ under S_α are finite (and thus by symmetry also the orbits of -1 and $\alpha-1$ are finite), then the set from (2) becomes finite and S_α has a finite Markov partition given by the intervals with endpoints in this set. For a concrete example, consider $\alpha = \frac{3}{2}$. One can see from Figure 1(c) that a Markov partition is then given by

$$\Big\{\Big(-1,-\frac{1}{2}\Big), \Big(-\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2}\Big), \Big(\frac{1}{2},1\Big)\Big\}.$$

For most values of α however, a Markov partition does not exist. In this case an explicit formula for the probability density h_α is given by

$$h_\alpha(x) = \frac{1}{C}\sum_{n\ge 0}\frac{1}{2^{n+1}}\Big(1_{[-1,S_\alpha^n(\alpha-1))}(x) - 1_{[-1,S_\alpha^n(-1))}(x) + 1_{[-1,S_\alpha^n(1))}(x) - 1_{[-1,S_\alpha^n(1-\alpha))}(x)\Big), \tag{3}$$

where C is a normalising constant. This formula is derived from the results in [Kop90]. The calculations can be found in the Appendix. It is clear from this formula that h_α becomes piecewise smooth if there is an $m \ge 1$, such that $S_\alpha^m(1) = S_\alpha^m(1-\alpha)$, i.e., if S_α has matching after m steps.

The family of maps $\{S_\alpha\}$ can be used to produce *signed binary expansions* of numbers in $[-1,1]$. These are expressions of the form $x = \sum_{n\ge 1}\frac{d_n}{2^n}$, where $d_n \in \{-1,0,1\}$ for each n. The digit 0 occurs in position n precisely when $S_\alpha^{n+1}(x) \in \big[-\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2}\big]$. An explicit expression of the density function as a finite sum of indicator functions would allow us to calculate the measure of the interval $\big[-\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2}\big]$ with respect to the invariant measure μ_α. By the Birkhoff Ergodic Theorem

for typical points x this quantity then equals the frequency of the digit 0 in the signed binary expansion of x given by the map S_α.

The original motivation for studying this particular family of maps comes from the area of number expansions. From the perspective of public key cryptography using elliptic curves there is an interest in finite expansions of integers having the lowest number of non-zero digits, which in case the digit set is $\{-1, 0, 1\}$ is equivalent to having the lowest *Hamming weight*. These so called minimal weight expansions have been well studied in literature, since they lead to faster computations in the encoding process (see for example [LK97, HP06, HM07] and the references therein). The advantages of using digit set $\{-1, 0, 1\}$ instead of $\{0, 1\}$ have been well known since the work of Morain and Olivos ([MO90]). In [DKL06], the map $S_{3/2}$ was studied in relation with these minimal weight signed binary expansions of integers. When one looks at the compactification of these sequences with the action of $S_{3/2}$ on them, then one sees that $\mu_{3/2}\big(\big[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\big]\big) = \frac{2}{3}$. This article gives an ergodic theoretic approach to finding minimal weight signed binary expansions. We conjecture that the largest possible value for $\mu_\alpha\big(\big[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\big]\big)$ is $\frac{2}{3}$ for any $\alpha \in [1, 2]$ and we indicate a large interval of α's for which this value is actually obtained, thus placing the results from [DKL06] in a wider framework and extending them. This is done by identifying intervals on which matching occurs.

For α-continued fraction transformations a very detailed description of the parameter sets on which matching occurs is available. These matching intervals exhibit a very intricate structure. Particularly interesting in this respect are the results from [BCIT13], where a correspondence is made between the non-matching values α for the α-continued fraction transformations and the set of kneading invariants for unimodal maps. As a result the authors recover results by Zakeri from [Zak03] which say that the set of external rays of the Mandelbrot set which land on the real axis has full Hausdorff dimension. They also find a relation to univoque numbers, in particular to a set introduced by Allouche and Cosnard in [AC83, AC01], leading to the proof of transcendentality of some univoque numbers. The results from this paper add another item to this list of correspondences. In Section 2 we describe the set of non-matching parameters for S_α using the results from [BCIT13].

In this article we prove that the set of α's for which S_α does not have matching has Lebesgue measure 0 and Hausdorff dimension 1. More in particular, we identify intervals in the parameter space, called *matching intervals*, with the property that all α's in such an interval have matching after the same number of steps. We also identify several values of α in the non-matching set. Using results from [CT12, BCIT13] we obtain a complete description of the matching behaviour of the maps S_α. With this information we can give an explicit formula for the density of the invariant measure on any matching interval and we calculate $\mu_\alpha\big(\big[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\big]\big)$. We prove that on each matching interval this value depends monotonically on α. We also prove that $\mu_\alpha\big(\big[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\big]\big) = \frac{2}{3}$ for any $\alpha \in [\frac{6}{5}, \frac{2}{3}]$.

It is interesting to note that the structure of the matching intervals closely resembles the situation for α-continued fractions and the piecewise linear maps from [BSORG13, CM, BCMP]. Up to now it seemed that this matching behaviour was related to the fact that different branches of the map have a different orientation. Our results show that this is not the case.

The article is organised as follows. In the second section we prove that matching happens Lebesgue almost everywhere and that the exceptional set has Hausdorff dimension 1 using a connection to the doubling map. In the third section we give more information on where matching happens and after how many steps exactly using a connection to α-continued fractions. In the process we slightly generalise the results from [CT12] on when matching happens exactly. We identify the matching intervals and some α's for which no matching occurs and no Markov partition exists. The fourth section discusses the relation between our results and other number systems, the α-continued fractions and unique β-expansions. In the fifth section we relate the matching results to the absolutely continuous invariant measure. We prove that this measure depends continuously

on α and we give an explicit formula for the density on each matching interval. We end with a final remark.

2. Matching almost everywhere

For $\alpha \in [1,2]$, let S_α be the symmetric doubling map from (1). It has two critical points: $-\frac{1}{2}$ and $\frac{1}{2}$. Due to the symmetry of the map, for almost all purposes it suffices to consider only one of the two. Note that $\lim_{x\uparrow\frac{1}{2}} S_\alpha(x) = 1$ and $\lim_{x\downarrow\frac{1}{2}} S_\alpha(x) = 1-\alpha$.

Definition 2.1. We say that the map S_α has *matching* if there is an $m \geq 1$, such that $S_\alpha^m(1) = S_\alpha^m(1-\alpha)$.

As mentioned in the introduction, usually the definition of matching also involves a condition on the derivatives of the maps at the moment of matching. Since the maps S_α have constant slope, this condition is automatically satisfied and we omit it from the definition. In this section we first make some general remarks about matching and the signed binary expansions produced by S_α and we prove that matching occurs Lebesgue almost everywhere. We treat the cases $\alpha = 1$ and $\alpha \in \left[\frac{3}{2}, 2\right]$ separately.

2.1. General properties of signed binary expansions.

Having a Markov partition or matching are both properties that depend on the orbits of the critical points. Define for each $x \in [-1,1]$ and $\alpha \in [1,2]$ the *signed digit sequence* $d_\alpha(x) = \big(d_{\alpha,n}(x)\big)_{n\geq 1}$ by

$$d_{\alpha,n}(x) = \begin{cases} -1, & \text{if } -1 \leq S_\alpha^{n-1}(x) < -\frac{1}{2}, \\ 0, & \text{if } -\frac{1}{2} \leq S_\alpha^{n-1}(x) \leq \frac{1}{2}, \\ 1, & \text{if } \frac{1}{2} < S_\alpha^{n-1}(x) \leq 1. \end{cases} \tag{4}$$

The orbits of S_α are then determined as follows:

$$S_\alpha^n(x) = 2^n x - d_{\alpha,1}(x)2^{n-1}\alpha - \cdots - d_{\alpha,n-1}(x)2\alpha - d_{\alpha,n}(x)\alpha. \tag{5}$$

From this it is clear that if there are $k \neq n$ such that $S_\alpha^n(1) = S_\alpha^k(1)$, then $\alpha \in \mathbb{Q}$. Hence, if $\alpha \notin \mathbb{Q}$, then S_α does not admit a Markov partition. Since the orbit of 1 is of particular importance, we denote the corresponding digit sequence by $d_\alpha = (d_{\alpha,n})_{n\geq 1} = d_\alpha(1)$. On digit sequences we consider the lexicographical ordering denoted by $\prec$.

Matching does not exclude a Markov partition and vice versa. For $\alpha = \frac{6}{5}$ for example (see Figure 1(e)), we have a Markov partition, but we do not have matching. The orbits of 1 and $1-\alpha$ are given by:

$$\begin{aligned} &S_\alpha(1) = 2-\alpha = \frac{4}{5}, && S_\alpha^2(1) = \frac{2}{5}, && S_\alpha^3(1) = S_\alpha(1), \\ &S_\alpha(1-\alpha) = S_\alpha\Big(-\frac{1}{5}\Big) = -\frac{2}{5}, && S_\alpha^2(1-\alpha) = -\frac{4}{5}, && S_\alpha^3(1-\alpha) = S_\alpha(1-\alpha). \end{aligned}$$

Note that $d_\alpha = 1(10)^\infty$. For $\alpha = \frac{4}{3}$ (see Figure 1(d)) there is matching and a Markov partition since $S_\alpha^2 1 = 0 = S_\alpha^2(1-\alpha)$. For $\alpha = \sqrt{3}$ (see Figure 1(b)) we have matching, but no Markov partition. The orbits of 1 and $1-\alpha$ are given by

$$S_\alpha(1) = 2-\sqrt{3} \quad \text{and} \quad S_\alpha(1-\sqrt{3}) = 2 - 2\sqrt{3} + \sqrt{3} = S_\alpha(1).$$

The next lemma on signed binary expansions will be of use later.

Lemma 2.1. *Let $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in (1,2)$, then $\alpha_1 < \alpha_2$ if and only if $d_{\alpha_2} \prec d_{\alpha_1}$.*

Proof. From the definition of the sequences d_α it follows that for any $\alpha \in [1,2]$,

$$1 = \alpha \sum_{n\geq 1} \frac{d_{\alpha,n}}{2^n}.$$

Hence, $d_{\alpha_1} \neq d_{\alpha_2}$ if and only if $\alpha_1 \neq \alpha_2$. First assume that $\alpha_1 < \alpha_2$ and let n be the smallest index such that $d_{\alpha_2,n+1} \neq d_{\alpha_1,n+1}$. Write

$$x_n = d_{\alpha_2,1}2^{n-1} + \cdots + d_{\alpha_2,n-1}2 + d_{\alpha_2,n} = d_{\alpha_1,1}2^{n-1} + \cdots + d_{\alpha_1,n-1}2 + d_{\alpha_1,n}.$$

Then by (5),

$$S^n_{\alpha_2}(1) = 2^n - x_n\alpha_2 < 2^n - x_n\alpha_1 = S^n_{\alpha_1}(1).$$

This gives $d_{\alpha_2,n+1} < d_{\alpha_1,n+1}$.

Now assume $d_{\alpha_2} \prec d_{\alpha_1}$, and let n be the first index such that $d_{\alpha_2,n+1} < d_{\alpha_1,n+1}$. Then by (5),

$$2^n - \Big(d_{\alpha_2,1}2^{n-1} + \cdots + d_{\alpha_2,n}\Big)\alpha_2 = S^n_{\alpha_2}(1) < S^n_{\alpha_1}(1) = 2^n - \Big(d_{\alpha_1,1}2^{n-1} + \cdots + d_{\alpha_1,n}\Big)\alpha_1,$$

implying $\alpha_2 > \alpha_1$. □

2.2. **The cases $\alpha = 1$ and $\alpha \in \left[\frac{3}{2}, 2\right]$.** In this section we discuss a few cases separately so that we can exclude them in the rest of the paper. For these values of α we determine if there is matching, what the density of the absolutely continuous invariant measure is and we give the frequency of the digit 0 in the corresponding signed binary expansions for typical points x.

If $\alpha = 1$, then $S^n_\alpha(1) = 1 = \alpha$ for all $n \geq 0$ and $S^n_\alpha(1-\alpha) = 0$ for all $n \geq 0$. So $S^n_\alpha(1) - S^n_\alpha(1-\alpha) = 1 = \alpha$ for all $n \geq 0$ and there is no matching. In this case the system splits into two copies of the doubling map, as can be seen from Figure 1(f). Normalized Lebesgue measure is invariant and $\mu_1\big(\big[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\big]\big) = \frac{1}{2}$.

From the introduction we already know that S_α has a Markov partition if $\alpha = \frac{3}{2}$. If $\alpha \in \left(\frac{3}{2}, 2\right]$, then $1 - \alpha < -\frac{1}{2}$ and $\alpha - 1 > 2 - \alpha$. This gives that $S_\alpha(1-\alpha) = 2(1-\alpha) + \alpha = 2 - \alpha = S_\alpha(1)$. Hence, we have matching after one step and we have identified our first matching interval. The invariant density h_α is a fixed point of the Perron-Frobenius operator $\mathcal{L}_\alpha$, which for S_α is given by

$$(\mathcal{L}_\alpha f)(x) = \frac{1}{2}\Big(f\Big(\frac{x}{2}\Big) + 1_{(\alpha-2,\alpha-1)}(x) f\Big(\frac{x-\alpha}{2}\Big) + 1_{(1-\alpha,2-\alpha)}(x) f\Big(\frac{x+\alpha}{2}\Big)\Big). \tag{6}$$

It is a straightforward calculation to check that for $\alpha \in \left[\frac{3}{2}, 2\right]$ the function $\hat{h}_\alpha : [-1, 1] \to [-1, 1]$ defined by

$$\hat{h}_\alpha(x) = 1 + 1_{(1-\alpha,\alpha-1)}(x)$$

satisfies $\mathcal{L}_\alpha \hat{h}_\alpha = \hat{h}_\alpha$. Since

$$\int_{-1}^{1} \hat{h}_\alpha(x)\, dx = 2 + \alpha - 1 - (1-\alpha) = 2\alpha,$$

the invariant probability density is given by $h_\alpha = \frac{1}{2\alpha}\hat{h}_\alpha$. Since $-1 \leq 1 - \alpha \leq -\frac{1}{2}$, we get

$$\mu_\alpha\big(\big[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\big]\big) = \frac{1}{2\alpha}\int_{-\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}} 1 + 1_{(1-\alpha,\alpha-1)}(x)\, dx = \frac{1}{\alpha},$$

which on the interval $\left[\frac{3}{2}, 2\right]$ is maximal for $\alpha = \frac{3}{2}$, giving $\mu_{\frac{3}{2}}\big(\big[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\big]\big) = \frac{2}{3}$.

2.3. **Relation with the doubling map.** From now on we assume $\alpha \in \left(1, \frac{3}{2}\right)$. By definition we have matching at time m if $S^m_\alpha(1) = S^m_\alpha(1-\alpha)$ and $S^n_\alpha(1) \neq S^n_\alpha(1-\alpha)$ for all $1 \leq n \leq m-1$. From (5) it follows that for each $n \geq 0$ there are $b, c \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that

$$S^n_\alpha(1) = 2^n - b\alpha \quad \text{and} \quad S^n_\alpha(1-\alpha) = 2^n - c\alpha.$$

Proposition 2.1. *For any $n \geq 0$, $S^n_\alpha(1) - S^n_\alpha(1-\alpha) \in \{0, \alpha\}$.*

Proof. We prove the statement by induction. For $n = 0$ it is true, since $1 - (1-\alpha) = \alpha$. Assume now that for some $n \geq 0$, $S^n_\alpha(1) - S^n_\alpha(1-\alpha) \in \{0, \alpha\}$. If $S^n_\alpha(1) - S^n_\alpha(1-\alpha) = 0$, then $S^k_\alpha(1) - S^k_\alpha(1-\alpha) = 0$ for all $k \geq n$, so assume that $S^n_\alpha(1) - S^n_\alpha(1-\alpha) = \alpha$. This implies that $-b\alpha + c\alpha = \alpha$, so $c = 1 + b$. Since $\alpha > 1$, $S^n_\alpha(1) > 0$ and $S^n_\alpha(1-\alpha) < 0$. Moreover, $S^n_\alpha(1)$ and $S^n_\alpha(1-\alpha)$ cannot both lie in the interval $\big[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\big]$. We distinguish three cases.

Case 1: Assume $0 < S_\alpha^n(1) < \frac{1}{2}$, so $S_\alpha^n(1-\alpha) < -\frac{1}{2}$. Then $S_\alpha^{n+1}(1) = 2^{n+1} - 2b\alpha$ and $S_\alpha^{n+1}(1-\alpha) = 2^{n+1} - 2c\alpha + \alpha = 2^{n+1} - 2(b+1)\alpha + \alpha = 2^{n+1} - 2b\alpha - \alpha$. Hence, $S_\alpha^{n+1}(1) - S_\alpha^{n+1}(1-\alpha) = \alpha$.

Case 2: Assume $S_\alpha^n(1) > \frac{1}{2}$ and $-\frac{1}{2} < S_\alpha^n(1-\alpha) < 0$. Then $S_\alpha^{n+1}(1) = 2^{n+1} - 2b\alpha - \alpha$ and $S_\alpha^{n+1}(1-\alpha) = 2^{n+1} - 2c\alpha = 2^{n+1} - 2(b+1)\alpha = 2^{n+1} - 2b\alpha - 2\alpha$. So, $S_\alpha^{n+1}(1) - S_\alpha^{n+1}(1-\alpha) = \alpha$.

Case 3: Assume $S_\alpha^n(1) > \frac{1}{2}$ and $S_\alpha^n(1-\alpha) < -\frac{1}{2}$. Then $S_\alpha^{n+1}(1) = 2^{n+1} - 2b\alpha - \alpha$ and $S_\alpha^{n+1}(1-\alpha) = 2^{n+1} - 2c\alpha + \alpha = 2^{n+1} - 2(b+1)\alpha + \alpha = 2^{n+1} - 2b\alpha - \alpha$. So, $S_\alpha^{n+1}(1) - S_\alpha^{n+1}(1-\alpha) = 0$ and matching occurs at step $n+1$.

In case $S_\alpha^n(1) = \frac{1}{2}$, the map S_α has a Markov partition, since $S_\alpha^n(1-\alpha) = \frac{1}{2} - \alpha$ and $\alpha > 1$ imply that $S_\alpha^{n+1}(1-\alpha) = 1 - 2\alpha + \alpha = 1 - \alpha$. A similar situation occurs when $S_\alpha^n(1-\alpha) = -\frac{1}{2}$ and $S_\alpha^n(1) = \alpha - \frac{1}{2} > \frac{1}{2}$. Then $S_\alpha^{n+1}(1) = 2\alpha - 1 - \alpha = \alpha - 1$. By (1) S_α does not have matching in these cases and $S_\alpha^n(1) - S_\alpha^n(1-\alpha) = \alpha$ for all $n \geq 0$. □

Remark 2.1. Consider again the situation that $S_\alpha^n(1) = \frac{1}{2}$ or $S_\alpha^n(1-\alpha) = -\frac{1}{2}$ for some n. Whether or not matching occurs depends on the choice made for the action of S_α on the critical points. Our definition from (1) implies that S_α does not have matching, but this is a choice.

From the proof of this proposition we can deduce more. First notice that as long as the difference between the two orbits is $\alpha > 1$, the orbit of 1 stays to the right of 0 and the orbit of $1-\alpha$ stays to the left. If for some m we have $S_\alpha^{m-1}(1) > \frac{1}{2}$ and $S_\alpha^{m-1}(1-\alpha) < -\frac{1}{2}$, then there is matching at time m. Since the distance between the two points is equal to α, this implies that then $S_\alpha^{m-1}(1) \in \left(\frac{1}{2}, \alpha - \frac{1}{2}\right)$. Define the *matching index* of α by

$$m(\alpha) = \inf\left\{n : \frac{1}{2} < S_\alpha^n 1 < \alpha - \frac{1}{2}\right\} + 1.$$

Then $S_\alpha^{m(\alpha)}(1) = S_\alpha^{m(\alpha)}(1-\alpha)$ and $S_\alpha^n(1) - S_\alpha^n(1-\alpha) = \alpha$ for all $0 \leq n < m(\alpha)$, so matching occurs after $m(\alpha)$ steps.

To prove that matching holds for almost all $\alpha \in \left(1, \frac{3}{2}\right)$, we explore the relation between S_α and the doubling map. Let $D : [0,1) \to [0,1), x \mapsto 2x \pmod 1$ denote the doubling map, see Figure 2(b). Both maps S_α and D are related to symbolic dynamical systems. Recall the signed digit sequences $d_\alpha(x)$ from (4). For $x \in [0,1)$ define the *binary digit sequence* $b(x) = \left(b_n(x)\right)_{n\geq 1}$ by

$$b_n(x) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } 0 \leq D^{n-1}(x) < \frac{1}{2}, \\ 1, & \text{if } \frac{1}{2} \leq D^{n-1}(x) < 1. \end{cases}$$

Everywhere in this article we use the dot notation to indicate that a sequence is evaluated as a binary expansion, so $x = {}_\bullet b(x)$. Recall that we use the notation d_α to denote the signed digit sequence of 1, $d_\alpha(1)$. The following relation between D and S_α exists:

Proposition 2.2. *Let $1 < \alpha < \frac{3}{2}$ and let m be the first index such that either $S_\alpha^m(1) \in \left(\frac{1}{2}, \alpha - \frac{1}{2}\right)$ or $D^m\left(\frac{1}{\alpha}\right) \in \left(\frac{1}{2\alpha}, 1 - \frac{1}{2\alpha}\right)$. Then $S_\alpha^n(1) = \alpha D^n\left(\frac{1}{\alpha}\right)$ and thus $d_{\alpha,n} = b_n\left(\frac{1}{\alpha}\right)$ for all $0 \leq n \leq m$. Moreover, both $S_\alpha^m(1) \in \left(\frac{1}{2}, \alpha - \frac{1}{2}\right)$ and $D^m\left(\frac{1}{\alpha}\right) \in \left(\frac{1}{2\alpha}, 1 - \frac{1}{2\alpha}\right)$.*

Proof. Note that the last statement immediately follows from the fact that $S_\alpha^m(1) = \alpha D^m\left(\frac{1}{\alpha}\right)$. We prove the first statement by induction. For $n = 0$ the statement holds, since $\alpha D^0\left(\frac{1}{\alpha}\right) = 1 = S_\alpha^0(1)$ and so $b_1\left(\frac{1}{\alpha}\right) = 1 = d_{\alpha,1}$. Now suppose that for some $n < m$ we have $S_\alpha^j(1) = \alpha D^j\left(\frac{1}{\alpha}\right)$ and $d_{\alpha,j} = b_j\left(\frac{1}{\alpha}\right)$ for all $j \leq n$. Similar to (5) it holds that

$$D^n\left(\frac{1}{\alpha}\right) = \frac{2^n}{\alpha} - b_1\left(\frac{1}{\alpha}\right)2^{n-1} - \cdots - b_n\left(\frac{1}{\alpha}\right) = \frac{2^n}{\alpha} - d_{\alpha,1}2^{n-1} - \cdots - d_{\alpha,n}.$$

So, $S_\alpha^n(1) = \alpha D^n\left(\frac{1}{\alpha}\right)$. We have $d_{\alpha,n+1} = 1$ if and only if $S_\alpha^n(1) \in \left(\alpha - \frac{1}{2}, 1\right]$, which by the previous holds if and only if $D^n\left(\frac{1}{\alpha}\right) \in \left(1 - \frac{1}{2\alpha}, \frac{1}{\alpha}\right] \subseteq \left(\frac{1}{2}, 1\right)$. Hence, $d_{\alpha,n+1} = 1$ if and only if $b_{n+1}\left(\frac{1}{\alpha}\right) = 1$. On the other hand, $d_{\alpha,n+1} = 0$ if and only if $S_\alpha^n(1) \in \left(\alpha - 1, \frac{1}{2}\right]$, which holds if and only if

$D^n\big(\frac{1}{\alpha}\big) \in \big(1-\frac{1}{\alpha}, \frac{1}{2\alpha}\big] \subseteq \big(0, \frac{1}{2}\big)$. Hence $d_{\alpha,n+1} = 0$ if and only if $b_{n+1}\big(\frac{1}{\alpha}\big) = 0$. This implies that

$$S_\alpha^{n+1}(1) = 2S_\alpha^n(1) - d_{\alpha,n+1}\alpha = \alpha\Big(2D^n\Big(\frac{1}{\alpha}\Big) - b_{n+1}\Big(\frac{1}{\alpha}\Big)\Big) = \alpha D^{n+1}\Big(\frac{1}{\alpha}\Big),$$

which proves the proposition. □

The previous proposition states that $m(\alpha)$ is equal to the smallest positive integer n such that $D^{n-1}\big(\frac{1}{\alpha}\big) \in \big(\frac{1}{2\alpha}, 1-\frac{1}{2\alpha}\big)$. We use this characterisation to prove matching almost everywhere in the next theorem.



(a) S_α for $\alpha \in \big(1, \frac{3}{2}\big)$ with the hole $\big(\frac{1}{2}, \alpha - \frac{1}{2}\big)$

(b) D with the hole $\big(\frac{1}{2\alpha}, 1-\frac{1}{2\alpha}\big)$

(c) T with the hole $\big[0, ?(\tilde{a})\big)$

(d) F with the hole $[0, \tilde{a})$

FIGURE 2. The maps S_α, D, T and F with the hole for matching indicated in yellow.

Theorem 2.1. *S_α has matching for Lebesgue almost all $\alpha \in \big(1, \frac{3}{2}\big)$. In particular, for Lebesgue almost all $\alpha \in [1, 2]$, it holds that $m(\alpha) < \infty$.*

Proof. Let $k \geq 7$. The ergodicity of D with respect to Lebesgue measure gives that for Lebesgue almost every $x \in (0,1)$ there is an $n \geq 1$, such that $D^n x \in \big(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{k}, \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{k}\big)$. Since $\alpha > \frac{k}{k-2}$ if and only if $\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{k} < 1 - \frac{1}{2\alpha}$, this means that for almost all $\alpha \in \big(\frac{k}{k-2}, \frac{3}{2}\big)$ matching occurs for S_α. Let A_k denote the set of all $\alpha \in \big(\frac{k}{k-2}, \frac{3}{2}\big)$ such that S_α does not have matching. Then A_k has zero Lebesgue measure and thus also $\bigcup_{k\geq 7} A_k$ has zero Lebesgue measure. Since $\bigcup_{k\geq 7} A_k$ equals the set of all $\alpha \in \big(1, \frac{3}{2}\big)$ such that S_α does not have matching, this finishes the proof. □

There is another way to obtain the previous result. Define the *non-matching set* $\mathcal{N}$ for the family S_α by

$$\mathcal{N} = \Big\{\alpha \in \Big(1, \frac{3}{2}\Big) \,:\, m(\alpha) = \infty\Big\}. \tag{7}$$

By Proposition 2.2 we have the following characterisation:

$$\mathcal{N} = \Big\{\alpha \in \Big(1, \frac{3}{2}\Big) \,:\, D^n\Big(\frac{1}{\alpha}\Big) \notin \Big(\frac{1}{2\alpha}, 1 - \frac{1}{2\alpha}\Big), \text{ for all } n \geq 1\Big\}.$$

In [AC83, AC01] Allouche and Cosnard introduced a set Γ in connection with univoque numbers:

$$\Gamma = \{x \in [0,1] \,:\, 1 - x \leq D^k(x) \leq x, \text{ for all } k \geq 1\}. \tag{8}$$

One easily checks that if $x \in \Gamma$, then $x > 2/3$, and $D^k(x) \notin \big(\frac{x}{2}, 1 - \frac{x}{2}\big)$ for all k, so $\mathcal{N} = \frac{1}{\Gamma}$. Let $T : [0,1] \to [0,1]$ denote the tent map, i.e.,

$$T(x) = \begin{cases} 2x, & \text{if } 0 \leq x \leq \frac{1}{2}, \\ 2 - 2x, & \text{if } \frac{1}{2} < x \leq 1, \end{cases}$$

see Figure 2(c). In [BCIT13, Lemma 5.5] Bonanno et al. gave a thorough description of the set

$$\Lambda = \{x \in [0,1] : T^k(x) \leq x, \text{ for all } k \geq 1\}. \tag{9}$$

They prove that $\Gamma = \Lambda \backslash \{0\}$ and show, among other things, that the derived set Λ', i.e., the set Λ minus its isolated points, is a Cantor set. In particular this yields that Λ is closed, uncountable, totally disconnected and has Lebesgue measure 0. From results on α-continued fractions in [CT12] it follows that Λ has Hausdorff dimension 1. Since $\mathcal{N}$ is homeomorphic to $\Lambda \backslash \{0\}$ via the bi-Lipschitz homeomorphism $x \mapsto \frac{1}{x}$ on $[1,2]$, we can use these correspondences to conclude that $\mathcal{N}$ has the following properties:

(i) the set $\mathcal{N}$ has cardinality of the continuum,
(ii) the set $\mathcal{N}$ has Lebesgue measure 0,
(iii) the set $\mathcal{N}$ has Hausdorff dimension 1,
(iv) the set $\mathcal{N}$ is totally disconnected and closed.

So, Theorem 2.1 also follows from the properties of Λ, but we think that the proof of Theorem 2.1 gives more insight. In the next section we use the relation with Λ to study the matching behaviour of S_α in more detail.

3. Matching intervals

Let $\{0,1\}^*$ denote the set of all finite words in the alphabet $\{0,1\}$. In this section we identify the blocks $\omega = \omega_1 \cdots \omega_m \in \{0,1\}^*$ that specify a matching interval J_ω, i.e., an interval with the property that every $\alpha \in J_\omega$ has ω as a prefix of d_α and has $m(\alpha) = m$.

3.1. **General matching intervals.** Let ϵ denote the empty word in $\{0,1\}^*$. Define the function $\psi : \{0,1\}^* \setminus \{\epsilon, 0, 1\} \to \{0,1\}^*$ by

$$\psi(\omega) = \psi(\omega_1 \cdots \omega_m) = \omega_1 \cdots \omega_m (1-\omega_1)(1-\omega_2)\cdots(1-\omega_{m-1})1.$$

To each block of digits $\omega_1 \cdots \omega_m \in \{0,1\}^*$ we associate a number x_m by

$$x_m = \omega_1 2^{m-1} + \cdots + \omega_{m-1}2 + \omega_m = 2^m \bullet \omega \tag{10}$$

and if $\omega_m = 1$ also a sequence of numbers $\ell_1, \ell_2, \ldots, \ell_{2n}$ by

$$\omega_1 \cdots \omega_m = 1^{\ell_1} 0^{\ell_2} 1^{\ell_3} \cdots 0^{\ell_{2n}} 1, \tag{11}$$

where $\ell_i \geq 1$ for all $i \neq 2n$ and $\ell_{2n} \geq 0$.

Definition 3.1. A block $\omega_1 \cdots \omega_m \in \{0,1\}^*$ is called *primitive* if all the following hold:

(i) $\omega_1 = \omega_2 = \omega_m = 1$;
(ii) $\omega_n \cdots \omega_m \preceq \omega_1 \cdots \omega_{m-n+1}$;
(iii) there is no block $b \in \{0,1\}^*$ such that $b \prec \omega_1 \cdots \omega_m \prec \psi(b)$.

Remark 3.1. The blocks from Definition 3.1 will be the blocks specifying matching intervals. Since ω must occur as a prefix of d_α for some α's, there are restrictions on ω imposed by the dynamics of S_α. These are conditions (i) and (ii), which are motivated as follows. $\omega_1 = \omega_2 = 1$ is necessary since $\alpha \in \left(1, \frac{3}{2}\right)$ and $\omega_m = 1$ follows from the fact that the last digit before matching is a 1. Condition (ii) is the usual restriction given by the dynamics of the system. In fact, if we let σ denote the left shift on sequences, then any digit sequence $d_\alpha(x)$ produced by the map S_α will satisfy the following lexicographical condition: for any $n \geq 0$,

$$\sigma^n(d_\alpha) \preceq d_\alpha. \tag{12}$$

Condition (iii) is the actual condition specifying which blocks correspond to a matching interval. It guarantees that matching occurs exactly at time m and not before.

Condition (iii) has a number of consequences on the properties of a primitive block $\omega = \omega_1 \cdots \omega_m$. It can be rephrased as follows: there is no j such that

$$1^{\ell_1} 0^{\ell_2} \cdots 1^{\ell_{2j-1}} \prec \omega_1 \cdots \omega_m \prec \psi(1^{\ell_1} 0^{\ell_2} \cdots 1^{\ell_{2j-1}}).$$

So in particular, $\ell_{2j} \leq \ell_1$ for each j. Moreover, it is clear that if $\ell_1 = \ell_2$, then $\omega_1 \cdots \omega_m$ is not primitive and if $\ell_{2j} = \ell_1$ for some $j < n$, then $\ell_{2j+1} \geq \ell_2$.

The next lemma gives a relation between the signed binary expansions of 1 and $\alpha - 1$, which can be used to deduce properties of d_α.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $\alpha \in \left(1, \frac{3}{2}\right)$. Then $d_{\alpha,j} = 1 - d_{\alpha,j}(\alpha - 1)$ for all $1 \le j < m(\alpha)$.*

Proof. Since S_α is symmetric, we have $S_\alpha(-x) = -S_\alpha(x)$. Using this, Proposition 2.1 implies that $S^j_\alpha(1) + S^j_\alpha(\alpha - 1) = \alpha$ for all $1 \le j < m(\alpha)$. Fix $1 \le j < m(\alpha)$. Then $d_{\alpha,j} \in \{0, 1\}$. Moreover, $d_{\alpha,j} = 1$ if and only if $S^j_\alpha(1) \in \left(\alpha - \frac{1}{2}, 1\right]$, which happens if and only if $S^j_\alpha(\alpha - 1) \in \left[\alpha - 1, \frac{1}{2}\right)$, so if and only if $d_{\alpha,j}(\alpha - 1) = 0$. Similarly, $d_{\alpha,j} = 0$ if and only if $d_{\alpha,j}(\alpha - 1) = 1$. This gives the lemma. □

A consequence of the previous lemma is that before the matching time $m(\alpha)$ a block of 0's in d_α can never be longer than the first block of 1's.

Lemma 3.2. *Let $\ell < m(\alpha)$, and write*

$$d_{\alpha,1}d_{\alpha,2}\cdots d_{\alpha,\ell} = 1^{\ell_1}0^{\ell_2}1^{\ell_3}0^{\ell_4}\cdots 0^{\ell_{2n}}1^{\ell_{2n+1}},$$

where $\ell = \ell_1 + \ell_2 + \cdots + \ell_{2n+1}$, $\ell_j \ge 1$ for each $j \le 2n$, and $\ell_{2n+1} \ge 0$. If $\ell_1 < m(\alpha)$, then for any $j \ge 1$ such that $\ell_1 + \cdots + \ell_{2j} < m(\alpha)$ we have $\ell_{2j} \le \ell_1$.

Proof. Since $\ell_1 < m(\alpha)$, we have $S^{\ell_1}_\alpha(1) \in [\alpha - 1, 1/2]$, and $S^j_\alpha(1) \in [\alpha - 1/2, 1]$ for $j = 0, 1, \cdots, \ell_1 - 1$. Hence, by the previous lemma, $S^{\ell_1}_\alpha(\alpha - 1) \in [\alpha - 1/2, 1]$, and $S^j_\alpha(\alpha - 1) \in [\alpha - 1, 1/2]$, $j = 0, 1, \cdots, \ell_1 - 1$. Since $S_\alpha\left(\alpha - \frac{1}{2}\right) = \alpha - 1$, the maximal number of consecutive 0's that can occur prior to matching is equal to the minimal m such that $S^j_\alpha(\alpha - 1) \in [\alpha - 1, 1/2]$, $j < m$, and $S^m_\alpha(\alpha - 1) = 2^m(\alpha - 1) > \frac{1}{2}$. Thus $m \le \ell_1$ and as a result $\ell_{2j} \le \ell_1$ for any $j \ge 1$ such that $\ell_1 + \cdots + \ell_{2j} < m(\alpha)$. □

The next lemma states some properties of the operation ψ which will be of use later.

Lemma 3.3. *The function ψ satisfies the following:*

(a) *For any block $b \in \{0, 1\}^*$, $b \prec \psi(b)$.*
(b) *If b, ω are two primitive blocks with $b \prec \omega$, then $\psi(b) \prec \psi(\omega)$.*
(c) *If ω is a primitive block, then $\psi(\omega)$ is primitive*

Proof. The first property is obvious. For the second property, just observe that if $\psi(\omega) \preceq \psi(b)$, then (a) gives that $b \prec \omega \prec \psi(\omega) \preceq \psi(b)$, which contradicts the primitivity of ω. For the last property, suppose $\psi(\omega)$ is not primitive. Then there is a primitive block b with $b \prec \psi(\omega) \prec \psi(b)$. By (b) we must have $\omega \prec b$, but this contradicts the primitivity of b. □

Let $\omega = \omega_1 \cdots \omega_m$ be a primitive block. Define the interval J_ω by

$$J_\omega := \left(\frac{2^m + 1}{x_m + 1}, \frac{2^m - 1}{x_m - 1}\right) = (L(\omega), R(\omega)),$$

where x_m is defined as in (10). This section is devoted to proving the following theorem.

Theorem 3.1. *Let $\omega = \omega_1 \cdots \omega_m \in \{0, 1\}^m$ be a primitive block. Then $\alpha \in J_\omega$ if and only if $d_{\alpha,i} = \omega_i$ for all $1 \le i \le m$ and $m(\alpha) = m$.*

The proof takes several steps and results from [CT12, BCIT13]. The main ingredient is a one-to-one correspondence between the intervals J_ω for primitive blocks ω and certain intervals I_a, called maximal quadratic intervals, introduced in [CT12]. We begin by introducing some notation.

Let $\omega \in \{0, 1\}^m$ and define the points $r^-(\omega)$ and $r^+(\omega)$ by

$$r^-(\omega) = \bullet\left(\omega_1 \cdots \omega_{m-1}0\right)^\infty \quad \text{and} \quad r^+(\omega) = \bullet\left(\omega_1 \cdots \omega_m(1 - \omega_1)\cdots(1 - \omega_m)\right)^\infty.$$

The relation between the map S_α and the doubling map D given in the previous section provides the following lemma.

Lemma 3.4. *Let $\omega = \omega_1 \cdots \omega_m$ be a primitive block. Then $\alpha \in J_\omega$ if and only if $\frac{1}{\alpha} \in \left(r^-(\omega), r^+(\omega)\right)$.*

Proof. It is enough to prove that the binary expansions of $\frac{1}{L(\omega)}$ and $\frac{1}{R(\omega)}$ are as given in the definitions of $r^-(\omega)$ and $r^+(\omega)$, i.e., that

$$\begin{aligned} b\Big(\frac{1}{L(\omega)}\Big) &= \big(\omega_1\cdots\omega_m(1-\omega_1)\cdots(1-\omega_m)\big)^\infty, \\ b\Big(\frac{1}{R(\omega)}\Big) &= \big(\omega_1\cdots\omega_{m-1}0\big)^\infty. \end{aligned}$$

Solving

$$\begin{aligned} D^{2m}(x) &= 2^{2m}x - \omega_1 2^{2m-1} - \cdots - 2^m\omega_m - 2^{m-1}(1-\omega_1) - \cdots - (1-\omega_m) \\ &= 2^{2m}x - 2^m(x_m - 1) - (2^m - 1) = x \end{aligned}$$

gives $x = \frac{1}{L(\omega)}$. Hence $\frac{1}{L(\omega)}$ is the fixed point of the branch of D^{2m} that corresponds to digits $\omega_1\cdots\omega_m(1-\omega_1)\cdots(1-\omega_m)$ proving that $\frac{1}{L(\omega)} = r^+(\omega)$. Similarly, solving

$$D^m(x) = 2^m x - \omega_1 2^{m-1} - \cdots - 2\omega_{m-1} = 2^m x - (x_m - 1) = x$$

gives $x = \frac{1}{R(\omega)}$ and hence $\frac{1}{R(\omega)} = r^-(\omega)$. □

Let $a \in \mathbb{Q}\cap(0,1]$ and denote its regular continued fraction expansion by $a = [0; a_1a_2\cdots a_n]$, where $a_n \geq 2$. Consider the two points $[0;(a_1\cdots a_n)^\infty]$ and $[0;(a_1\cdots a_{n-1}(a_n-1)1)^\infty]$. Then

$$[0;(a_1\cdots a_n)^\infty] < [0;(a_1\cdots a_{n-1}(a_n-1)1)^\infty]$$

if n is odd and

$$[0;(a_1\cdots a_n)^\infty] > [0;(a_1\cdots a_{n-1}(a_n-1)1)^\infty]$$

if n is even. Define

$$\begin{aligned} a^- &= \min\big\{[0;(a_1\cdots a_n)^\infty], [0;(a_1\cdots a_{n-1}(a_n-1)1)^\infty]\big\}, \\ a^+ &= \max\big\{[0;(a_1\cdots a_n)^\infty], [0;(a_1\cdots a_{n-1}(a_n-1)1)^\infty]\big\}. \end{aligned}$$

In [CT12] an interval $I_a := (a^-, a^+)$ is called a *quadratic interval*. The intervals $\big(r^-(\omega), r^+(\omega)\big)$ appear in [BCIT13] as the images of certain quadratic intervals, called maximal quadratic intervals, under a function $\varphi : [0,1] \to \big[\frac{1}{2}, 1\big]$, which is given as follows. If $x \in [0,1]$ has regular continued fraction expansion $x = [0; a_1a_2a_3\cdots]$, then

$$\varphi(x) = \bullet\underbrace{11\cdots1}_{a_1}\underbrace{00\cdots0}_{a_2}\underbrace{11\cdots1}_{a_3}\cdots. \tag{13}$$

[BCIT13, Theorem 1.1] states that φ is an orientation reversing homeomorphism. Assign a quadratic interval to each of our primitive blocks by defining

$$a(\omega) := \begin{cases} [0;\ell_1\ell_2\cdots\ell_{2n-2}(\ell_{2n-1}+1)], & \text{if } \ell_{2n} = 0, \\ [0;\ell_1\ell_2\cdots\ell_{2n-1}(\ell_{2n}+1)], & \text{if } \ell_{2n} > 0, \end{cases} \tag{14}$$

where the ℓ_j are given by the representation in the form (11) of ω. The following lemma can be verified by direct computation.

Lemma 3.5. *Let ω be a primitive block. Then $\varphi(I_{a(\omega)}) = \big(r^-(\omega), r^+(\omega)\big)$.*

Proof. Since the proofs for $\ell_{2n} > 0$ and $\ell_{2n} = 0$ are essentially the same, we prove the statement for $\ell_{2n} > 0$ and leave the case $\ell_{2n} = 0$ to the reader. If $\ell_{2n} > 0$, then

$$a(\omega)^- = [0;(\ell_1\cdots\ell_{2n}1)^\infty]$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(a(\omega)^-) &= \bullet(1^{\ell_1}0^{\ell_2}\cdots0^{\ell_{2n}}10^{\ell_1}1^{\ell_2}\cdots1^{\ell_{2n}}0)^\infty \\ &= \bullet\big(\omega_1\cdots\omega_m(1-\omega_1)\cdots(1-\omega_m)\big)^\infty = r^+(\omega). \end{aligned}$$

A similar calculation shows that $\varphi(a(\omega)^+) = r^-(\omega)$ and the result then follows from the fact that φ is an orientation reversing homeomorphism. □

In [CT12] a quadratic interval I_a is called *maximal* if it is not properly contained in any other quadratic interval. Primitive blocks correspond to maximal quadratic intervals.

Lemma 3.6. *If $\omega \in \{0,1\}^*$ is a primitive block, then $I_{a(\omega)}$ is a maximal quadratic interval.*

Proof. Suppose that $I_{a(\omega)}$ is not a maximal quadratic interval. By the results of [CT12] this means that there exists a maximal quadratic interval I_a properly containing $I_{a(\omega)}$. Write $a = [0; a_1 \cdots a_k]$ with $a_k \geq 2$. We distinguish two cases, k is even and k is odd. Begin by assuming that k is even, so $a = [0; a_1 \cdots a_{2n}]$ for some $n \geq 1$. Define $\eta = 1^{a_1}0^{a_2} \cdots 0^{a_{2n}-1}1$, then $a = a(\eta)$. Write

$$(r^-, r^+) = \varphi(I_{a(\eta)}) = \left(\bullet(1^{a_1}0^{a_2} \cdots 0^{a_{2n}})^\infty, \bullet(1^{a_1}0^{a_2} \cdots 0^{a_{2n}-1}10^{a_1}1^{a_2} \cdots 1^{a_{2n}-1}0)^\infty\right).$$

Recall the definitions of $\mathcal{N}$ and Λ from (7) and (9). Combined results from [BCIT13] state that $\Lambda\backslash\{0\}$ is exactly the set of points in $\left[\frac{1}{2}, 1\right]$ that are not in the image of any maximal interval under φ, giving that the endpoints of $\varphi(I_a)$ are in $\Lambda\backslash\{0\}$. Since $\mathcal{N} = \frac{1}{\Lambda\backslash\{0\}}$, we have $\frac{1}{r^-}, \frac{1}{r^+} \in \mathcal{N}$. Proposition 2.2 then implies that $b(r^-) = d_{1/r^-}$ and $b(r^+) = d_{1/r^+}$. Hence,

$$\left(r^-(\omega), r^+(\omega)\right) = \varphi(I_{a(\omega)}) \subseteq \varphi(I_a) = (r^+, r^-),$$

where the inclusion is proper. This implies that J_ω is a proper subset of J_η.

We now show that $\eta \prec \omega \prec \psi(\eta)$, so that ω is not primitive. Let $|\eta|$ denote the length of η. Consider first $d_{1/r^-} = (1^{a_1}0^{a_2} \cdots 0^{a_{2n}})^\infty$. From this signed binary expansion we see that $S^{|\eta|}_{1/r^-}(1) = 1$, so that $S^{|\eta|-1}_{1/r^-}(1) = \frac{1}{2}$. Lemma 2.1 then implies that $\alpha < \frac{1}{r^-}$ if and only if

$$d_\alpha \succ 1^{a_1}0^{a_2} \cdots 0^{a_{2n}-1}1 = \eta.$$

Similarly, $d_{1/r^+} = (1^{a_1}0^{a_2} \cdots 0^{a_{2n}-1}10^{a_1}1^{a_2} \cdots 1^{a_{2n}-1}0)^\infty$ implies that $S^{2|\eta|-1}_{1/r^+}(1) = \frac{1}{2}$. So $\alpha > \frac{1}{r^+}$ implies

$$d_\alpha \prec 1^{a_1}0^{a_2} \cdots 0^{a_{2n}-1}10^{a_1}1^{a_2} \cdots 1^{a_{2n}-1}1 = \psi(\eta).$$

Hence for each $\alpha \in J_\omega$ we have $\eta \prec d_\alpha \prec \psi(\eta)$ and in particular this last statement holds for ω.

The case $a = [0; a_1 \cdots a_{2n-1}]$ for some $n \geq 1$ goes along exactly the same lines, using

$$r^- = \bullet(1^{a_1}0^{a_2} \cdots 1^{a_{2n-1}-1}0)^\infty \quad \text{and} \quad r^+ = \bullet(1^{a_1}0^{a_2} \cdots 1^{a_{2n-1}}0^{a_1}1^{a_2} \cdots 0^{a_{2n-1}})^\infty. \qquad \square$$

We also have the statement from the previous lemma in the other direction.

Lemma 3.7. *Let I_a be a maximal quadratic interval corresponding to $a = [0; a_1 \cdots a_n]$ with $a_n \geq 2$. Define the block $\omega \in \{0,1\}^*$ by setting*

$$\omega = \begin{cases} 1^{a_1}0^{a_2} \cdots 1^{a_{n-1}}0^{a_n-1}1, & \text{if } n \text{ is even,} \\ 1^{a_1}0^{a_2} \cdots 0^{a_{n-1}}1^{a_n}, & \text{if } n \text{ is odd.} \end{cases}$$

Then ω is primitive and $a = a(\omega)$.

Proof. Let I_a be maximal as given in the statement of the lemma and assume that ω is not a primitive block. Then there is another block $b = 1^{a_1}0^{a_2} \cdots 0^{a_{2k-2}}1^{a_{2k-1}} \in \{0,1\}^*$ with $2k-1 < n$, such that $b \prec \omega \prec \psi(b)$. Suppose n is even, then

$$\begin{aligned} b &= 1^{a_1}0^{a_2} \cdots 0^{a_{2k-2}}1^{a_{2k-1}}, \\ \omega &= 1^{a_1}0^{a_2} \cdots 0^{a_{2k-2}}1^{a_{2k-1}}0^{a_{2k}}1^{a_{2k+1}} \cdots 0^{a_{4k-2}}1^{a_{4k-1}} \cdots 0^{a_n-1}1, \\ \psi(b) &= 1^{a_1}0^{a_2} \cdots 0^{a_{2k-2}}1^{a_{2k-1}}0^{a_1}1^{a_2} \cdots 0^{a_{2k-1}-1}1. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that either there is a first $1 \leq j \leq 2k-1$ such that $a_{2k+j-1} > a_j$ if j is odd or $a_{2k+j-1} < a_j$ if j is even or $a_{4k-2} \geq a_{2k-1}$.

Let $<_g$ denote the ordering on $\mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$ induced by the Gauss map $x \mapsto \frac{1}{x} \pmod 1$ on the regular continued fraction expansions, i.e., $c_1c_2 \cdots <_g d_1d_2 \cdots$ if and only if the first index n such that $c_n \neq d_n$ is even and $c_n < d_n$ or it is odd and $c_n > d_n$. Then for $x = [0; c_1c_2 \cdots]$ and $y = [0; d_1d_2 \cdots] \in [0,1]$ we have $x < y$ if and only if $c_1c_2 \cdots <_g d_1d_2 \cdots$. Recall that we use σ to

denote the left shift on sequences. By [CT12, Proposition 2.13 and Lemma 4.4] it follows from the fact that I_a is maximal, that either

$$(a_1 \cdots a_n)^\infty <_g \sigma^i\big((a_1 \cdots a_n)^\infty\big)$$

for all $1 \le i \le n-1$ (so $a_1 \cdots a_n$ is the smallest under $<_g$ of all its cyclic permutations) or $\frac{n}{2}$ is odd, $a_1 \cdots a_{n/2}$ is smallest under $<_g$ of all its cyclic permutations and

$$\sigma^{n/2}\big((a_1 \cdots a_n)^\infty\big) = (a_1 \cdots a_n)^\infty.$$

We use this to get a contradiction.

Consider the cyclic permutation $a_{2k}a_{2k+1} \cdots a_n a_1 \cdots a_{2k}$ of $a_1 \cdots a_n$. If there is a j such that $a_{2k+j-1} \neq a_j$ or if $a_{4k-2} = a_{2k-1}$, then by the definition of $<_g$ we get

$$(a_{2k}a_{2k+1} \cdots a_n a_1 \cdots a_{2k-1})^\infty <_g (a_1 \cdots a_n)^\infty.$$

This would imply that $\sigma^{n/2}\big((a_1 \cdots a_n)^\infty\big) = (a_1 \cdots a_n)^\infty$, where $\frac{n}{2}$ is odd and $a_1 \cdots a_{n/2}$ is smallest under $<_g$ of all its cyclic permutations. Write $a' = [0; a_1 \cdots a_{n/2}]$. [CT12, Proposition 2.13] then implies that $I_{a'}$ is maximal. By the same reasoning as above, the block $\omega' = 1^{a_1}0^{a_2} \cdots 1^{a_{n/2}}$ must be primitive. By Lemma 3.3 (c), $\omega = \psi(1^{a_1}0^{a_2} \cdots 1^{a_{n/2}})$ must be primitive as well.

One can easily check that $a = a(\omega)$ from the definition in (14). □

Figure 3 shows the relation between the intervals used in the lemmas above.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} J_\omega = \big(L(\omega), R(\omega)\big) & \xleftarrow[x \mapsto 1/x]{} & \big(r^-(\omega), r^+(\omega)\big) = \big(\frac{1}{L(\omega)}, \frac{1}{R(\omega)}\big) \\ & & \Big\updownarrow \varphi \\ & & I_a(\omega) = \big(a^-(\omega), a^+(\omega)\big) \end{array}$$

FIGURE 3. The relations between the various intervals discussed in the proofs of Lemmas 3.4, 3.5, 3.6 and 3.7.

Now Lemmas 3.6 and 3.7 together imply that there is a one-to-one correspondence between the maximal quadratic intervals I_a and the intervals J_ω for primitive ω. As mentioned in the proof of Lemma 3.6, it follows from the results in [BCIT13] that any $\alpha \in (1,2)$ either lies in $\mathcal{N}$ or in an interval J_ω for a primitive block ω. The endpoints $L(\omega)$ and $R(\omega)$ of J_ω for a primitive block ω are in $\mathcal{N}$. Hence, $m(L(\omega)) = \infty = m(R(\omega))$ and by Proposition 2.2 we obtain that $b_{1/L(\omega)} = d_{L(\omega)}$ and $b(1/R(\omega)) = d_{R(\omega)}$. This puts us in the position to find the signed binary expansions of 1 for these values of α.

Proposition 3.1. *Let $\omega = \omega_1 \cdots \omega_m$ be a primitive block. Using the notation above we have,*

(i) *if $\alpha = L(\omega)$, then $m(\alpha) = \infty$ and $d_\alpha = \big(\omega_1 \cdots \omega_m(1-\omega_1)\cdots(1-\omega_m)\big)^\infty$,*
(ii) *if $\alpha = R(\omega)$, then $m(\alpha) = \infty$ and $d_\alpha = \big(\omega_1 \cdots \omega_{m-1}0\big)^\infty$.*

Proof. For (i) consider the sequence $(b_n)_{n\ge1} = \big(\omega_1 \cdots \omega_m(1-\omega_1)\cdots(1-\omega_m)\big)^\infty$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n\ge1}\frac{b_n}{2^n} &= \sum_{j=1}^{m}\omega_j 2^{m-2}\Big(\frac{1}{2^{2m}} + \frac{1}{2^{4m}} + \frac{1}{2^{6m}} + \cdots\Big) \\ &\quad + (2^{m-1} + \cdots + 2 + 1)\Big(\frac{1}{2^{2m}} + \frac{1}{2^{4m}} + \frac{1}{2^{6m}} + \cdots\Big) \\ &= \frac{\omega_1 2^{m-1} + \cdots + \omega_{m-1}2 + \omega_m + 1}{2^m + 1} = \frac{1}{L(\omega)}. \end{aligned}$$

Since the sequence $(b_n)_{n\ge1}$ does not end in an infinite string of zeros or ones, $(b_n)_{n\ge1}$ is the unique binary expansion of the point $\frac{1}{L(\omega)}$ and hence $d_{L(\omega)}$ is as given in the lemma. A similar calculation proves the statement for $R(\omega)$. □

To prove Theorem 3.1, we need to prove that matching occurs at the right time, i.e., at time m and not before. In [CT12] the authors show that the maximal quadratic intervals are matching intervals for the α-continued fraction maps, but they do not explicitly exclude the possibility that matching occurs before the desired matching time. We will extend their results slightly in this respect by examining the orbits of points in $I_{a(\omega)}$ under the Farey map. Later we will link this information to orbits under the doubling map. The Farey map $F : [0,1] \to [0,1]$ is defined by

$$F(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{x}{1-x}, & \text{if } 0 \le x \le \frac{1}{2}, \\ \\ \frac{1-x}{x}, & \text{if } \frac{1}{2} < x \le 1, \end{cases}$$

see Figure 2(d). There is an intimate relationship between the regular continued fraction expansion of a point and its orbit under the Farey map, due to the fact that the Gauss map $x \mapsto \frac{1}{x} \pmod 1$ is an induced transformation of F. If x has regular continued fraction expansion $x = [0; a_1 a_2 a_3 \cdots]$, then

$$F(x) = \begin{cases} [0; (a_1 - 1) a_2 a_3 \cdots], & \text{if } a_1 > 1, \\ [0; a_2 a_3 \cdots], & \text{if } a_1 = 1. \end{cases}$$

Lemma 3.8. *Let $\omega \in \{0,1\}^m$ be a primitive block and $\alpha \in J_\omega$. Let $\tilde{a} = \varphi^{-1}\big(\frac{1}{\alpha}\big)$. Then $F^m(\tilde{a}) \in [0, \tilde{a})$, $F^{m-1}(\tilde{a}) \in \big(\frac{1}{\tilde{a}+1}, 1\big]$ and $F^n(\tilde{a}) \notin [0, \tilde{a})$ for all $0 \le n < m$.*

Proof. Recall the definition of $a(\omega)$ from (14). From Lemma 3.5 and the fact that φ is a homeomorphism, it follows that $\varphi\big(1/J_\omega\big) = I_{a(\omega)}$. From the regular continued fraction expansions it immediately follows that m is the smallest index such that $F^m\big(a(\omega)\big) = 0$, and that $F^m(a(\omega)^+) = a(\omega)^+$ and $F^m(a(\omega)^-) = a(\omega)^-$. Since the first $m-1$ digits of $a(\omega)^-$ and $a(\omega)^+$ are equal,

$$F^n(I_{a(\omega)}) = \big(\min\{F^n(a(\omega)^-), F^n(a(\omega)^+)\}, \max\{F^n(a(\omega)^-), F^n(a(\omega)^+)\}\big)$$

for all $1 \le n \le m-2$ or in more general terms F^n maps the interval $I_{a(\omega)}$ to an interval. Moreover,

$$\min\{F^{m-2}(a(\omega)^-), F^{m-2}(a(\omega)^+)\} < \frac{1}{2} < \max\{F^{m-2}(a(\omega)^-), F^{m-2}(a(\omega)^+)\},$$

which implies that $F^m(\tilde{a}) \in [0, \tilde{a})$ for all $\tilde{a} \in I_{a(\omega)}$. This gives the first two statements of the lemma. Figure 4 illustrates the above.

We now prove, using the primitivity of the word ω, that $a(\omega)^-$ and $a(\omega)^+$ are the smallest points in their respective orbits under F, i.e., $F^n\big(a(\omega)^-\big) \ge a(\omega^-)$ for all n and the same holds for $a(\omega)^+$. Again write $\omega = 1^{\ell_1} 0^{\ell_2} \cdots 0^{\ell_{2n}} 1$. Suppose first that $\ell_{2n} > 0$ and consider $F^{\ell_1 + \cdots + \ell_j}(a(\omega)^-)$ for some j, so

$$F^{\ell_1 + \cdots + \ell_j}(a(\omega)^-) = [0; \overline{\ell_{j+1} \cdots \ell_{2n-1}(\ell_{2n}+1)\ell_1 \cdots \ell_j}] := [0; \overline{\ell'_1 \cdots \ell'_{2n}}].$$

If $\ell'_1 \cdots \ell'_{2n} = \ell_1 \cdots \ell_{2n-1}(\ell_{2n}+1)$, then $F^{\ell_1 + \cdots + \ell_j}(a(\omega)^-) = a(\omega)^-$, so suppose that there is a first index k such that $\ell'_k \ne \ell_k$. Suppose j is even. Due to condition (ii) from Definition 3.1 we have $\ell_k > \ell'_k$ if k is odd and $\ell_k < \ell'_k$ if k is even. In both cases $F^{\ell_1 + \cdots + \ell_j}(a(\omega)^-) > a(\omega)^-$. Suppose j is odd. This implies that $\omega_1 \cdots \omega_{j+k-1}$ is a prefix of $\psi(\omega_1 \cdots \omega_j)$. To satisfy condition (iii) from Definition 3.1 we must have $\ell_k > \ell'_k$ if k is odd and $\ell_k < \ell'_k$ if k is even. Hence, again we get that $F^{\ell_1 + \cdots + \ell_j}(a(\omega)^-) > a(\omega)^-$. If $F^{\ell_1 + \cdots + \ell_j}(a(\omega)^-) \ge a(\omega)^-$, then $F^n(a(\omega^-)) \ge a(\omega)^-$ for all $\ell_1 + \cdots + \ell_j \le n < \ell_1 + \cdots + \ell_{j+1}$ and thus $a(\omega)^-$ is the smallest point in its orbit under F. The proof is exactly the same for $\ell_{2n} = 0$ and $a(\omega)^+$.

Since $F^n(I_{a(\omega)})$ is completely contained in either $\big[0, \frac{1}{2}\big)$ or $\big(\frac{1}{2}, 1\big]$ for all $0 \le n < m-2$, we have that $F^n(I_{a(\omega)})$ is an interval with $\lambda\big(F^n(I_{a(\omega)})\big) > \lambda\big(F^{n-1}(I_{a(\omega)})\big)$. From $F^n(a(\omega)^-) > a(\omega)^-$ and $F^n(a(\omega)^+) > a(\omega)^+$ for all $0 < n < m$ we can conclude that for all $\tilde{a} \in I_{a(\omega)}$ we have $F^n(\tilde{a}) \notin [0, \tilde{a})$ for all $0 \le n < m$. □

Let $? : [0,1] \to [0,1]$ denote the Minkowski Question Mark Function and recall that it can be defined as follows. If $x \in [0,1]$ has regular continued fraction expansion $x = [0; a_1 a_2 \cdots]$, then

$$?(x) = \bullet \underbrace{00\cdots0}_{a_1 - 1} \underbrace{11\cdots1}_{a_2} \underbrace{00\cdots0}_{a_3} \cdots .$$



(a) $I_{a(\omega)}$ (b) $FI_{a(\omega)}$

(c) $F^2I_{a(\omega)}$ (d) $F^3I_{a(\omega)}$ (e) $F^4I_{a(\omega)}$

FIGURE 4. The images of the interval $I_{a(\omega)}$ for $\omega = 1101$ under iterations of F. Since $m = 4$, we see $F^{m-2}I_{a(\omega)}$ in (c), $F^{m-1}I_{a(\omega)}$ in (d) and $F^mI_{a(\omega)}$ in (e). The dashed lines indicate the position of the original interval $I_{a(\omega)}$, the red line indicates the position of $F^n(a^-(\omega))$ and the green line the position of $F^n(a^+(\omega))$.

This leads to $\varphi(x) + \frac{1}{2}?(x) = 1$. Also note that $? \circ F = T \circ ?$ and $T \circ D = T \circ T$. We use all these facts to prove the following.

Lemma 3.9. *Let $\omega \in \{0,1\}^m$ be a primitive block and $\alpha \in J_\omega$. Then $D^{m-1}\left(\frac{1}{\alpha}\right) \in \left(\frac{1}{2\alpha}, 1 - \frac{1}{2\alpha}\right)$ and $D^n\left(\frac{1}{\alpha}\right) \notin \left(\frac{1}{2\alpha}, 1 - \frac{1}{2\alpha}\right)$ for all $0 \le n \le m-2$.*

Proof. Let $\tilde{a} = \varphi^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{\alpha}\right)$. By the previous lemma we have that $F^{m-1}(\tilde{a}) \in \left(\frac{1}{\tilde{a}+1}, 1\right]$ and $F^n(\tilde{a}) \notin \left(\frac{1}{\tilde{a}+1}, 1\right]$ for all $n < m-1$. Since $?$ is a strictly increasing continuous function from $[0,1]$ to $[0,1]$ we have $T^{m-1}(?(\tilde{a})) \in \left(1 - \frac{?(\tilde{a})}{2}, 1\right]$ and $T^n(?(\tilde{a})) \notin \left(1 - \frac{?(\tilde{a})}{2}, 1\right]$ for all $n < m-1$. From $\varphi(\tilde{a}) + \frac{1}{2}?(\tilde{a}) = 1$, we get $?(\tilde{a}) = 2 - \frac{2}{\alpha} = T\left(\frac{1}{\alpha}\right)$. So $T^m\left(\frac{1}{\alpha}\right) \in \left(\frac{1}{\alpha}, 1\right]$ and $T^n\left(\frac{1}{\alpha}\right) \notin \left(\frac{1}{\alpha}, 1\right]$ for all $n < m$. Using $T \circ D = T \circ T$ in turn implies that $D^n\left(\frac{1}{\alpha}\right) \notin \left(\frac{1}{2\alpha}, 1 - \frac{1}{2\alpha}\right)$ for all $n < m-1$ and $D^{m-1}\left(\frac{1}{\alpha}\right) \in \left(\frac{1}{2\alpha}, 1 - \frac{1}{2\alpha}\right)$. □

Proof (of Theorem 3.1). Let $\omega = \omega_1 \cdots \omega_m$, $m \ge 2$, be a primitive block. The proof that for each $\alpha \in J_\omega$ $m(\alpha) = m$ is now given by combining Lemma 3.9 and Proposition 2.2. The fact that $d_{\alpha,1} \cdots d_{\alpha,m} = \omega$ follows from Lemma 2.1. For the other implication, assume that $\alpha \notin J_\omega$. Then either $\alpha \in \mathcal{N}$, so there is no matching, or there is another primitive $\omega' = \omega'_1 \cdots \omega'_k$ such that $\alpha \in J_{\omega'}$. If $k \ne m$, then $m(\alpha) = k \ne m$. If $k = m$, then $d_{\alpha_1} \cdots d_{\alpha,m} = \omega'_1 \cdots \omega'_m \ne \omega_1 \cdots \omega_m$. □

Example 3.1. To illustrate the relation between all the different sets in the previous proofs, we consider an example. Let $\omega = 111011$. This is a primitive block with $J_\omega = \left(\frac{13}{12}, \frac{63}{58}\right)$ and hence, $\left(r^-(\omega), r^+(\omega)\right) = \left(\frac{58}{63}, \frac{12}{13}\right)$. Then $a(\omega) = [0; 312] = \frac{3}{11}$, which gives

$$a(\omega)^- = [0; \overline{312}] = \frac{\sqrt{37} - 5}{4}, \quad a(\omega)^+ = [0; \overline{3111}] = \frac{\sqrt{165} - 9}{14}.$$

Let $\alpha = \frac{1024}{945} \in J_\omega$. Then $d_\alpha = 11101100010\overline{10}$ and

$$\tilde{a} = \phi^{-1}\Big(\frac{1}{\alpha}\Big) = [0; 3124] = \frac{2\sqrt{155} - 23}{7}.$$

Then $F^6(\tilde{a}) \in [0, \tilde{a})$, $D^5\big(\frac{945}{1024}\big) \in \big(\frac{945}{2048}, \frac{1103}{2048}\big)$ and $S_\alpha^6(1) = S_\alpha^6(1-\alpha)$, so $m(\alpha) = 6$.

3.2. **Thue-Morse-like matching intervals.** The matching intervals J_ω exhibit a type of period doubling behaviour that we will describe next. This will also lead us to identify specific points in the non-matching set $\mathcal{N}$ that are transcendental.

Proposition 3.2. *Let $\omega = \omega_1 \cdots \omega_m$ be a primitive block. Then $L(\omega) = R(\psi(\omega))$.*

Proof. Use the notation $x_m = \omega_1 2^{m-1} + \cdots + \omega_{m-1}2 + \omega_m$ as before. Then $L(\omega) = \frac{2^m+1}{x_m+1}$ and $R(\phi(\omega)) = \frac{2^{2m}-1}{x_{2m}-1}$, where

$$\begin{aligned} x_{2m} &= \omega_1 \cdot 2^{2m-1} + \cdots + \omega_{m-1} \cdot 2^{m+1} + 2^m + (1-\omega_1) \cdot 2^{m-1} + \cdots + (1-\omega_{m-1}) \cdot 2 + 1 \\ &= 2^m x_m + 2^m - x_m = 2^m(x_m + 1) - x_m. \end{aligned}$$

This implies

$$x_{2m} - 1 = 2^m(x_m + 1) - (x_m + 1) = (2^m - 1)(x_m + 1).$$

Hence,

$$\frac{2^{2m} - 1}{x_{2m} - 1} = \frac{(2^m + 1)(2^m - 1)}{(2^m - 1)(x_m + 1)} = \frac{2^m + 1}{x_m + 1}. \qquad \square$$

So, attached to each matching interval is a whole cascade of matching intervals corresponding to the blocks $\psi^n(\omega)$. Call the limit of this sequence of blocks $\underline{\omega}$, hence $\underline{\omega} := \lim_{n\to\infty} \psi^n(\omega)$. Note that $\underline{\omega}$ does not depend on where in the cascade we choose to start. Write

$$p_\omega = \sum_{n\geq 1} \frac{\underline{\omega}_n}{2^n}.$$

Then $\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{x_n}{2^n} = p_\omega$, which gives that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} L\big(\psi^n(\omega)\big) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{2^{2^n m} + 1}{x_{2^n m} + 1} = \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1 + \frac{1}{2^{2^n m}}}{\frac{x_{2^n m}}{2^{2^n m}} + \frac{1}{2^{2^n m}}} = \frac{1}{p_\omega}.$$

Example 3.2. Consider the primitive block 11. Then $I_{11} = \big(\frac{5}{4}, \frac{3}{2}\big)$, so for each $\alpha \in I_{11}$, S_α has matching after 2 steps. We also have $\psi(11) = 1101$ and $I_{1101} = \big(\frac{17}{14}, \frac{5}{4}\big)$. For any α in this interval, S_α has matching after four steps. The limit $\underline{11} = \lim_{n\to\infty} \psi^n(11)$ is the shifted Thue-Morse sequence. Recall that the Thue-Morse substitution is given by

$$0 \mapsto 01, \quad 1 \mapsto 10.$$

The Thue-Morse sequence is the fixed point of this substitution, which is

$$t = 0110\,1001\,10010110\,1001011001101001 \cdots,$$

and the Thue-Morse constant p^* is the number that has this sequence as its base 2 expansions, i.e., $p^* = \sum_{n\geq 1} \frac{t_n}{2^n} \approx 0.412454$. The limit sequence $\underline{11}$ is the sequence obtained when we shift the Thue-Morse sequence one place to the left. For the corresponding constant we get

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} L\big(\psi^n(11)\big) = \frac{1}{p_{11}} = \frac{1}{2p^*} \approx 1.212216, \tag{15}$$

which is transcendental (see [Dek77]).

The previous example illustrates a general pattern. Let $\omega \in \{0,1\}^m$ be a primitive block. Then $d_{R(\omega)} = (\omega_1 \cdots \omega_{m-1}0)^\infty$ by Proposition 3.1. Note that this sequence cannot be periodic with a smaller period, since this would contradict condition (ii) of Definition 3.1 with ω ending in 1. We conclude that $S_\alpha^{m-1}(1) = \frac{1}{2}$ and $S_\alpha^m(1) = 1$. This implies that $S_\alpha^{m-1}(1-\alpha) = \frac{1}{2} - \alpha < -\frac{1}{2}$ and $S_\alpha^m(1-\alpha) = 1 - \alpha$. So S_α has a Markov partition, but does not have matching. Obviously $R(\omega) \in \mathbb{Q}$ for all primitive ω's. Results from [BCIT13] give us the following proposition.

Proposition 3.3. *Let $\omega \in \{0,1\}^m$ be a primitive block. Then $\frac{1}{p_\omega} \in \mathcal{N}$ and $\frac{1}{p_\omega}$ is transcendental.*

Proof. Since $\mathcal{N}$ contains exactly those points that are not in any matching interval J_ω, we have $\frac{1}{p_\omega} = \lim_{n\to\infty} L(\psi^n(\omega)) \in \mathcal{N}$. To prove that $\frac{1}{p_\omega}$ is transcendental, we invoke [BCIT13, Proposition 4.7]. We first introduce the necessary notation.

For a finite word $\eta = \eta_1 \cdots \eta_p \in \{0,1\}^p$, let $\hat{\eta} = (1-\eta_1)\cdots(1-\eta_p)$. Write $\Delta(\eta) = \eta 1 \hat{\eta}$ and $\tau_0(\eta) = \bullet(\eta 0)^\infty$. Set $\tau_j(\eta) = \tau_0(\Delta^j(\eta))$ and $\tau_\infty(\eta) = \lim_{j\to\infty} \tau_j(\eta)$. Clearly, if we take $\eta = \omega_1 \cdots \omega_{m-1}$, then $\psi^j(\omega) = \Delta^j(\eta)1$ for each $j \geq 0$ and hence, $p_\omega = \tau_\infty(\omega_1 \cdots \omega_{m-1})$ is transcendental by [BCIT13, Proposition 4.7]. From this it follows that $\frac{1}{p_\omega}$ is transcendental. □

4. Relations to other dynamical systems and number expansions

In this section we explore further the set $\mathcal{N} = \left\{\alpha \in \left(1, \frac{3}{2}\right) : m(\alpha) = \infty\right\}$ and the intervals J_ω in relation to other dynamical systems, more in particular to α-continued fraction transformations and to univoque numbers.

4.1. **Signed binary expansions and α-continued fractions.** We have explored the relation between the signed binary expansions and the regular continued fractions quite extensively in the previous section using results from [BCIT13]. Here we would just like to emphasise some points.

The purpose of [BCIT13] was to investigate the Nakada or α-continued fraction transformations defined as follows. For a parameter $a \in [0,1]$, let $T_a : [a-1, a] \to [a-1, a]$ be the transformation given by

$$T_a(x) = \frac{1}{|x|} - \left\lfloor \frac{1}{|x|} + 1 - a \right\rfloor$$

if $x \neq 0$ and $T_a(0) = 0$. (The parameter is usually called α, hence the name, but since we have used α for other purposes in this article, we will call the parameter a.) As explained in the introduction, for each parameter a the map T_a has a unique absolutely continuous invariant probability measure ν_a. The function $a \mapsto h_{\nu_a}(T_a)$ mapping the parameter to the metric entropy of the map T_a is continuous. The maximal quadratic intervals introduced in Section 3.1 are exactly the maximal parameter intervals on which this function is monotone. The set of bifurcation parameters is called $\mathcal{E}$ in [BCIT13]. Recall the definition of the function $\varphi : [0,1] \to \left[\frac{1}{2}, 1\right]$ from (13) and of the set Λ from (9). The main theorem from [BCIT13] states that $\varphi(\mathcal{E}) = \Lambda$ and that $\varphi : [0,1] \to \left[\frac{1}{2}, 1\right]$ is an orientation reversing homeomorphism. By Lemmas 3.6 and 3.7 the function $f : [0,1] \to [1,2], x \mapsto \frac{1}{\varphi(x)}$ is an order preserving homeomorphism taking the intervals on which the entropy function of the α-continued fraction transformation is monotone to the matching intervals of the symmetric doubling maps.

4.2. **Signed binary expansions and univoque numbers.** The common link between the results from [BCIT13] and our case is the set Γ from (8), which was first introduced and studied by Allouche and Cosnard ([AC83, AC01]) in connection with univoque numbers. Given a number $1 < \beta < 2$, one can express all real numbers $x \in \left[0, \frac{1}{\beta-1}\right]$ as a *β-expansion*: $x = \sum_{n\geq 1} \frac{c_n}{\beta^n}$ for some sequence $(c_n)_{n\geq 1} \in \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$. Typically a number x has uncountably many different expansions of this form. The number $1 < \beta < 2$ is called *univoque* if there is a unique sequence $(c_n)_{n\geq 1} \in \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ such that $1 = \sum_{n\geq 1} \frac{c_n}{\beta^n}$, i.e., if 1 has a unique β-expansion. Let $\mathcal{U}$ denote the set of univoque bases. The properties of $\mathcal{U}$ were studied by many authors. There exists an equivalent characterisation of univoque numbers in terms of admissible sequences, which is mainly due to Parry ([Par60]), see also [EJK90]. A sequence $(c_n)_{n\geq 1} \in \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ is *admissible* if and only if

$$\begin{cases} c_{k+1}c_{k+2}\cdots \prec c_1 c_2 \cdots, & \text{if } c_k = 0, \\ \\ c_{k+1}c_{k+2}\cdots \succ c_1 c_2 \cdots, & \text{if } c_k = 1, \end{cases}$$

for all k. It is easy to check that admissibility is equivalent to

$$(1-c_1)(1-c_2)\cdots \prec c_{k+1}c_{k+2}\cdots \prec c_1 c_2 \cdots$$

for all $k \geq 1$. In [EJK90] it is proved that a sequence $(c_n)_{n\geq 1}$ is admissible if and only if there is a univoque $\beta > 1$ such that $1 = \sum_{n\geq 1} \frac{c_n}{\beta^n}$. In [AC01] the authors showed that there is a one-to-one correspondence between admissible sequences and the points in Γ that do not have a periodic binary expansion. It is easy to check that for each primitive block ω the limit $\underline{\omega}$ satisfies the condition of being admissible, which also proves that $\frac{1}{p_\omega} \in \mathcal{N}$. Hence each limit of a primitive block corresponds to a univoque number, namely to the value $\beta > 1$ for which the expansion $1 = \sum_{n\geq 1} \frac{\underline{\omega}_n}{\beta^n}$ is unique.

In [KL98] Komornik and Loreti identified the smallest element of $\mathcal{U}$, now called the Komornik Loreti constant. It is the value of β that has $1 = \sum_{n\geq 1} \frac{\underline{11}_{n+1}}{\beta^n}$, where $\underline{11}$ is the shifted Thue-Morse sequence that we saw before in Example 3.2. In [KL07, dVK09] the set of univoque numbers is investigated in even more detail. (In fact they consider the larger set of all univoque numbers $\beta > 1$, but since we are not interested in $\beta \geq 2$ here, we let $\mathcal{U}$ be their set $\mathcal{U}$ intersected with $(1, 2)$.) Using the quasi-greedy β-expansion of 1 they introduced a set $\mathcal{V}$ related to the admissible sequences. For $1 < \beta < 2$, the *quasi-greedy* β-expansion of 1 is the largest sequence in lexicographical ordering representing 1 in base β not ending in 0^∞. If we denote this sequence by $\big(q_n(\beta)\big)_{n\geq 1} \in \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$, then $\mathcal{V}$ consists of those values $1 < \beta < 2$ that satisfy

$$(1 - q_{k+1}(\beta))(1 - q_{k+2}(\beta)) \cdots \preceq q_1(\beta)q_2(\beta) \cdots$$

for all $k \geq 1$. Then $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{U}} \subseteq \mathcal{V}$ and $\mathcal{V}$ is closed. The authors of [KL07] show among other things that $\mathcal{V}\backslash\mathcal{U}$ is countable. In [dVK09] it is proved that $(1, 2)\backslash\mathcal{V}$ is a countable union of open intervals (β_1, β_2), where the set of right endpoints of these intervals is exactly $\mathcal{V}\backslash\overline{\mathcal{U}}$ and the set of left endpoints is given by $\{1\} \cup (\mathcal{V}\backslash\mathcal{U})$. Moreover, [dVK09, Proposition 6.1] states that for each β_2 the quasi-greedy expansion of 1 satisfies

$$\big(q_n(\beta_2)\big)_{n\geq 1} = \big(q_1 \cdots q_k(1 - q_1) \cdots (1 - q_k)\big)^\infty,$$

where k is the minimal index with this property, and that the quasi-greedy expansion of 1 in base β_1 is then given by

$$\big(q_n(\beta_1)\big)_{n\geq 1} = \big(q_1 \cdots q_{k-1}0\big)^\infty.$$

On the connected components (β_1, β_2) of $(1, 2)\backslash\mathcal{V}$ there is some sort of behaviour that resembles matching. For each base $\beta \in (1, 2)$, define the set

$$\mathcal{U}'_\beta := \Big\{(c_n)_{n\geq 1} \in \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}} : x = \sum_{n\geq 1} \frac{c_n}{\beta^n} \text{ has a unique expansion in base } \beta\Big\}.$$

Hence, $\mathcal{U}'_\beta$ contains all sequences that correspond to unique expansions in base β. Then [dVK09, Theorem 1.7] states that the intervals $(\beta_1, \beta_2]$, where (β_1, β_2) is a connected component of $(1, 2)\backslash\mathcal{V}$ correspond exactly to what they call *maximally stable intervals*, which means that $\mathcal{U}'_\beta = \mathcal{U}'_\gamma$ for any $\beta, \gamma \in (\beta_1, \beta_2]$ and that this property does not hold for any larger interval containing $(\beta_1, \beta_2]$.

Define the map $u : \Lambda\backslash\mathbb{Q}_1 \to [1, 2]$ by mapping $\tau = \sum_{n\geq 1} \frac{c_n}{2^n}$ to the unique value $\beta \in (1, 2)$ that satisfies $1 = \sum_{n\geq 1} \frac{c_n}{\beta^n}$. In [BCIT13, Remark 5.8] the authors state that u can be extended to a homeomorphism between Λ' and $\overline{\mathcal{U}}$. The above now implies that the map $g : \mathcal{N} \to \mathcal{V}, \alpha \mapsto u\big(\frac{1}{\alpha}\big)$ is a homeomorphism. Hence, there is a one-to-one correspondence between the connected components of the set $(1, 2)\backslash\mathcal{V}$ and the matching intervals of the family $\{S_\alpha\}$.

5. The invariant measure and number of 0's

In this section we consider the absolutely continuous invariant measure μ_α on any of the matching intervals J_ω. We will give a formula for $\mu_\alpha\big(\big[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\big]\big)$ on J_ω, since by the Birkhoff Ergodic Theorem this value corresponds to the frequency of the digit 0 in the signed binary expansions $d_\alpha(x)$ for Lebesgue almost every $x \in [-1, 1]$. Recall the formula for the invariant probability density from (3). This formula is obtained by applying results from [Kop90]. In the Appendix we explain how we obtained this formula.

Suppose that we have matching after m steps. Hence, $S_\alpha^m(1) = S_\alpha^m(1-\alpha)$ and $S_\alpha^m(\alpha-1) = S_\alpha^m(-1)$. Moreover, before matching we have $S_\alpha^n(1) = S_\alpha^n(1-\alpha)+\alpha$ and $S_\alpha^n(\alpha-1) = S_\alpha^n(-1)+\alpha$. This gives

$$h_\alpha(x) = \frac{1}{C}\sum_{n=0}^{m-1}\frac{1}{2^{n+1}}\Big(1_{[S_\alpha^n(1-\alpha),S_\alpha^n(1))}(x) + 1_{[S_\alpha^n(-1),S_\alpha^n(\alpha-1))}(x)\Big),$$

where C is the normalising constant. C is related to the total measure, which is

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_\alpha([-1,1]) &= \frac{1}{C}\int_{-1}^{1} h_\alpha(x)dx = \frac{2}{C}\sum_{n=0}^{m-1}\frac{1}{2^{n+1}}\big(S_\alpha^n(1) - S_\alpha^n(1-\alpha)\big)\\ &= \frac{\alpha}{C}\Big(\frac{1-\frac{1}{2^m}}{1-\frac{1}{2}}\Big) = \frac{2\alpha}{C}\Big(1-\frac{1}{2^m}\Big) = 1,\end{aligned}$$

where we have used that $S_\alpha^n(1) = S_\alpha^n(1-\alpha)+\alpha$ before matching. Hence, $\frac{1}{C} = \frac{1}{2\alpha}\frac{2^m}{2^m-1}$. The results from [Kop90] also imply that there is only one invariant density for each α.

We first prove that the map $\alpha \mapsto h_\alpha$ is continuous.

Theorem 5.1. *Let $\alpha \in [1,2]$ and let $\{\alpha_k\}_{k\geq 1} \subseteq [1,2]$ be a sequence converging to α. Then $h_{\alpha_k} \to h_\alpha$ in L^1.*

This proof uses some standard techniques involving the Perron-Frobenius operator, see [Via] and [LM08] for example. Recall the definition of the Perron-Frobenius operator $\mathcal{L}_\alpha$ for S_α from (6). For a function $f : [-1,1] \to \mathbb{R}$, let $Var(f)$ denote its total variation. We define the set BV to be the set of functions $f : [-1,1] \to \mathbb{R}$ of bounded variation, so with $Var(f) < \infty$.

Proof. For all $n \geq 1$, let $\mathcal{P}_\alpha^n$ denote the collection of cylinder sets of S_α of rank n, that is, $\mathcal{P}_\alpha^n$ consists of precisely the intervals of monotonicity of S_α^n. Let $f \in BV$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}Var(\mathcal{L}_\alpha^n f) &\leq \sum_{I\in\mathcal{P}_\alpha^n} Var\Big(\frac{f\circ(S_\alpha^n|_I)^{-1}}{(S_\alpha^n)'\circ(S_\alpha^n|_I)^{-1}}1_{S_\alpha^n(I)}\Big)\\ &= \sum_{I\in\mathcal{P}_\alpha^n} Var\Big(\frac{f}{2^n}1_I\Big) = Var\Big(f\sum_{I\in\mathcal{P}_\alpha^n}\frac{1}{2^n}1_I\Big)\\ &= Var(f2^{-n}) = 2^{-n}Var(f).\end{aligned}$$

Note that this bound is independent of α, so that the obtained bound holds for each α_k.

Fix some $k \geq 1$. Define $h_{k,n} = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=0}^{n-1}\mathcal{L}_{\alpha_k}^j(1)$ and recall that $\lim_{n\to\infty} h_{k,n} = h_{\alpha_k}$ Lebesgue a.e. Moreover,

$$Var(h_{k,n}) \leq \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} Var(\mathcal{L}_{\alpha_k}^j(1)) \leq \frac{1}{2^n}Var(1) = 0$$

and

$$\sup|h_{k,n}| \leq Var(h_{k,n}) + \int_{[-1,1]} h_{k,n}d\lambda \leq \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=0}^{n-1}\int_{[-1,1]}\mathcal{L}_{\alpha_k}^j(1)d\lambda = \lambda([-1,1]).$$

Since both of these bounds are independent of α_k and n, we also have $\sup|h_{\alpha_k}| \leq \lambda([-1,1])$ and $Var(h_{\alpha_k}) = 0$ for each k. From Helly's Theorem it then follows that there is a subsequence $\{k_i\}$ and an $h_\infty \in BV$ such that $h_{\alpha_{k_i}} \to h_\infty$ in L^1 and Lebesgue a.e. and with $\sup|h_\infty| \leq \lambda([-1,1])$ and $Var(h_\infty) = 0$. We show that $h_\infty = h_\alpha$.

To show that $h_\infty = h_\alpha$, we prove that for each Borel set $B \subseteq [-1,1]$ we have

$$\int_B h_\infty d\lambda = \int_{S_\alpha^{-1}(B)} h_\infty d\lambda. \tag{16}$$

The desired result then follows from the uniqueness of the invariant density. First note that $1_B \in L^1(\lambda)$, so it can be approximated arbitrarily closely by compactly supported C^1 functions. So instead of (16) we prove that

$$\Big| \int_{[-1,1]} (f \circ S_\alpha) h_\infty d\lambda - \int_{[-1,1]} f\, h_\infty d\lambda \Big| = 0$$

for any compactly supported C^1 function on $[-1,1]$. (Hence $\|f\|_\infty < \infty$.) We split this into three parts:

$$\begin{aligned}\Big| \int_{[-1,1]} (f \circ S_\alpha) h_\infty d\lambda - \int_{[-1,1]} f\, h_\infty d\lambda \Big| \le{}& \Big| \int_{[-1,1]} (f \circ S_\alpha) h_\infty d\lambda - \int_{[-1,1]} (f \circ S_\alpha) h_{\alpha_{k_i}} d\lambda \Big| \\ &+ \Big| \int_{[-1,1]} (f \circ S_\alpha) h_{\alpha_{k_i}} d\lambda - \int_{[-1,1]} (f \circ S_{\alpha_{k_i}}) h_{\alpha_{k_i}} d\lambda \Big| \\ &+ \Big| \int_{[-1,1]} (f \circ S_{\alpha_{k_i}}) h_{\alpha_{k_i}} d\lambda - \int_{[-1,1]} f\, h_\infty d\lambda \Big|.\end{aligned}$$

Then for the first part we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\Big| \int_{[-1,1]} (f \circ S_\alpha) h_\infty d\lambda - \int_{[-1,1]} (f \circ S_\alpha) h_{\alpha_{k_i}} d\lambda \Big| \\ &\qquad \le \Big| \int_{[-1,1]} \big(\sup_{x \in [-1,1]} f(x) \big) (h_\infty - h_{\alpha_{k_i}}) d\lambda \\ &\qquad \le \|f\|_\infty \int_{[-1,1]} |h_\infty - h_{\alpha_{k_i}}| d\lambda = \|f\|_\infty \|h_\infty - h_{\alpha_{k_i}}\|_{L^1}.\end{aligned}$$

For the third part we get

$$\begin{aligned}\Big| \int_{[-1,1]} (f \circ S_{\alpha_{k_i}}) h_{\alpha_{k_i}} d\lambda - \int_{[-1,1]} f\, h_\infty d\lambda \Big| &= \Big| \int_{[-1,1]} f\, h_{\alpha_{k_i}} d\lambda - \int_{[-1,1]} f\, h_\infty d\lambda \Big| \\ &\le \|f\|_\infty \|h_\infty - h_{\alpha_{k_i}}\|_{L^1}.\end{aligned}$$

Hence, these two parts converge to 0 as $i \to \infty$. Now, for the middle part we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\Big| \int_{[-1,1]} (f \circ S_\alpha) h_{\alpha_{k_i}} d\lambda - \int_{[-1,1]} (f \circ S_{\alpha_{k_i}}) h_{\alpha_{k_i}} d\lambda \Big| \\ &\qquad \le \int_{[-1,1]} \big| (f \circ S_\alpha) - (f \circ S_{\alpha_{k_i}}) \big| h_{\alpha_{k_i}} d\lambda \\ &\qquad \le \big(\sup_{x \in [-1,1]} h_{\alpha_{k_i}} \big) \int_{[-1,1]} \big| (f \circ S_\alpha) - (f \circ S_{\alpha_{k_i}}) \big| d\lambda \\ &\qquad \le \lambda([-1,1]) \int_{[-1,1]} \big| (f \circ S_\alpha) - (f \circ S_{\alpha_{k_i}}) \big| d\lambda.\end{aligned}$$

We split this integral into three parts again, now according to the intervals of monotonicity of S_α. Note that by the Dominated Convergence Theorem and by the continuity of f, we have

$$\lim_{i \to \infty} \int_{[-1,-1/2)} \big| (f \circ S_\alpha) - (f \circ S_{\alpha_{k_i}}) \big| d\lambda = \int_{-1}^{-1/2} \lim_{i \to \infty} \big| f(2x + \alpha_{k_i}) - f(2x + \alpha) \big| dx = 0.$$

Similarly, we can prove that the integral converges to 0 on $\big[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\big]$ and $\big(\frac{1}{2}, 1\big]$. Hence, $h_\infty = h_\alpha$ Lebesgue a.e. In fact, the proof shows that for each subsequence of (h_{α_k}) there is a further subsequence that converges a.e (and in L^1) to h_α. This is equivalent to saying that the sequence (h_{α_k}) converges in measure to h_α. Since $h_\beta \le 2 \in L^1$ for any β, this implies that (h_{α_k}) is uniformly integrable, so by Vitali's Theorem the sequence (h_{α_k}) converges in L^1 to h_α. □

We also obtain the following result.

Corollary 5.1. *The function $\alpha \mapsto \mu_\alpha\big(\big[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\big]\big)$ is continuous.*

Proof. Let $\{\alpha_n\}$ be a sequence converging to α. Note that

$$|\mu_\alpha\Big(\Big[-\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2}\Big]\Big)-\mu_{\alpha_n}\Big(\Big[-\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2}\Big]\Big)|\leq\int_{[-1/2,1/2]}|h_\alpha-h_{\alpha_n}|d\lambda.$$

Since $\{h_{\alpha_n}\}\subseteq L^1([-1,1])$, $\|h_{\alpha_n}\|_\infty<\lambda([-1,1])$, $h_\alpha\in L^1([-1,1])$ and $h_{\alpha_n}\to h_\alpha$ in L^1, we have $\int f(h_{\alpha_n}-h_\alpha)d\lambda\to 0$ for any $f\in L^1([-1,1])$. The proof of this can be found in [AOT06]. This gives the result. □

We now give a precise description of the measure of the middle interval $\big[-\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2}\big]$. The fact that before matching $S^n_\alpha(1)=S^n_\alpha(1-\alpha)+\alpha$ in particular implies that $S^n_\alpha(1)$ will only visit $\big[-\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2}\big]$ and $\big(\frac{1}{2},1\big]$ and $S^n_\alpha(1-\alpha)$ will only visit $\big[-1,-\frac{1}{2}\big)$ and $\big[-\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2}\big]$. Moreover, $S^n_\alpha(1)$ and $S^n_\alpha(1-\alpha)$ will never both be in $\big[-\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2}\big]$. We also know that matching occurs immediately after $S^n_\alpha(1)\in\big(\frac{1}{2},1\big]$ and $S^n_\alpha(1-\alpha)\in\big[-1,-\frac{1}{2}\big)$. So, up to one step before matching we always have exactly one of the two orbits in $\big[-\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2}\big]$.

Let $\omega=\omega_1\cdots\omega_m$ be a primitive block and $\alpha\in J_\omega$. In order to determine $\mu_\alpha\big(\big[-\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2}\big]\big)$ we need to describe functions of the form $x\mapsto 1_{[S^n_\alpha(1-\alpha),S^n_\alpha(1))}(x)1_{[-\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2}]}(x)$. Note that for $0\leq n\leq m-2$ if $\omega_{n+1}=1$, then

$$1_{[S^n_\alpha(1-\alpha),S^n_\alpha(1))}(x)1_{[-\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2}]}(x)=1_{[S^n_\alpha(1-\alpha),\frac{1}{2}]}(x)$$

and if $\omega_{n+1}=0$, then

$$1_{[S^n_\alpha(1-\alpha),S^n_\alpha(1))}(x)1_{[-\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2}]}(x)=1_{[-\frac{1}{2},S^n_\alpha(1))}(x).$$

Moreover,

$$1_{[S^{m-1}_\alpha(1-\alpha),S^{m-1}_\alpha(1))}(x)1_{[-\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2}]}(x)=1_{[-\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2}]}(x).$$

Due to symmetry, the measure of $[-\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2}]$ is then given by

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_\alpha\Big(\Big[-\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2}\Big]\Big) &= \frac{1}{C}\int_{[-\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2}]}h_\alpha(x)dx\\ &= \frac{1}{C}\sum_{\substack{0\leq n\leq m-2:\\ \omega_{n+1}=1}}\frac{1}{2^n}\Big(\frac{1}{2}-S^n_\alpha(1-\alpha)\Big)+\frac{1}{C}\sum_{\substack{0\leq n\leq m-2:\\ \omega_{n+1}=0}}\frac{1}{2^n}\Big(S^n_\alpha(1)+\frac{1}{2}\Big)+\frac{1}{C2^{m-1}}\\ &= \frac{1}{C}\Big(\frac{1}{2^{m-1}}+\sum_{n=0}^{m-2}\frac{1}{2^{n+1}}+\sum_{\substack{0\leq n\leq m-2:\\ \omega_{n+1}=1}}\Big(\frac{\alpha}{2^n}-\frac{1}{2^n}S^n_\alpha(1)\Big)+\sum_{\substack{0\leq n\leq m-2:\\ \omega_{n+1}=0}}\frac{1}{2^n}S^n_\alpha(1)\Big).\end{aligned}$$

Observe that if $m=1$, the above two summations are zero. In this case

$$\mu_\alpha\Big(\Big[-\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2}\Big]\Big)=\frac{1}{C}=\frac{1}{\alpha},$$

as we saw before. For $m\geq 2$, we get

$$\mu_\alpha\Big(\Big[-\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2}\Big]\Big)=\frac{1}{C}\Big(1+\sum_{\substack{0\leq n\leq m-2:\\ \omega_{n+1}=1}}\Big(\frac{\alpha}{2^n}-\frac{1}{2^n}S^n_\alpha(1)\Big)+\sum_{\substack{0\leq n\leq m-2:\\ \omega_{n+1}=0}}\frac{1}{2^n}S^n_\alpha(1)\Big).$$

If $m=2$, then $\frac{1}{C}=\frac{2}{3\alpha}$ and $\omega_1=1$, so for all $\alpha\in J_{11}$,

$$\mu_\alpha\Big(\Big[-\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2}\Big]\Big)=\frac{1}{C}(1+\alpha-1)=\frac{2}{3}.$$

Assume $m\geq 3$, and recall that for $n\leq m$ we have $S^n_\alpha(1)=2^n-x_n\alpha$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_\alpha\Big(\Big[-\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2}\Big]\Big) &= \frac{1}{C}\Big(\alpha+\sum_{\substack{1\leq n\leq m-2:\\ \omega_{n+1}=1}}\Big(\frac{\alpha}{2^n}-\frac{1}{2^n}S^n_\alpha(1)\Big)+\sum_{\substack{1\leq n\leq m-2:\\ \omega_{n+1}=0}}\frac{1}{2^n}S^n_\alpha(1)\Big)\\ &= \frac{1}{C}\Big(\alpha+\sum_{\substack{1\leq n\leq m-2:\\ \omega_{n+1}=1}}\Big(\frac{\alpha}{2^n}-1+\frac{x_n\alpha}{2^n}\Big)+\sum_{\substack{1\leq n\leq m-2:\\ \omega_{n+1}=0}}\Big(1-\frac{x_n\alpha}{2^n}\Big)\Big).\end{aligned}$$

Let

$$\eta(\omega) = \#\{2 \le n \le m-1 : \omega_n = 0\} - \#\{2 \le n \le m-1 : \omega_n = 1\}.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_\alpha\Big(\Big[-\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2}\Big]\Big) &= \frac{1}{C}\Big(\alpha + \eta(\omega) + \alpha\Big(\sum_{\substack{1\le n\le m-2:\\ \widetilde{\omega}_{n+1}=1}}\Big(\frac{1}{2^n}+\frac{x_n}{2^n}\Big) - \sum_{\substack{1\le n\le m-2:\\ \widetilde{\omega}_{n+1}=0}}\frac{x_n}{2^n}\Big)\\ &= \frac{2^{m-1}}{2^m-1}\Big(\frac{\eta(\omega)}{\alpha} + \frac{x_{m-1}}{2^{m-2}} + \sum_{\substack{1\le n\le m-2:\\ \widetilde{\omega}_{n+1}=1}}\frac{x_n}{2^n} - \sum_{\substack{1\le n\le m-2:\\ \widetilde{\omega}_{n+1}=0}}\frac{x_n}{2^n}\Big),\end{aligned}$$

where we have used that $\displaystyle\sum_{\substack{1\le n\le m-2:\\ \widetilde{\omega}_{n+1}=1}}\frac{1}{2^n} = \sum_{1\le n\le m-2}\frac{\omega_{n+1}}{2^n} = \frac{x_{m-1}}{2^{m-2}} - 1$. If $\omega_{n+1}=1$, then $\frac{x_{n+1}}{2^{n+1}} = \frac{x_n}{2^n} + \frac{1}{2^{n+1}}$ and if $\omega_{n+1}=0$, then $\frac{x_{n+1}}{2^{n+1}} = \frac{x_n}{2^n}$. This gives

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_\alpha\Big(\Big[-\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2}\Big]\Big) &= \frac{2^{m-1}}{2^m-1}\Big(\frac{\eta(\omega)}{\alpha} + \frac{x_{m-1}}{2^{m-2}} + \sum_{\substack{2\le n\le m-1:\\ \omega_n=1}}\Big(\frac{x_n}{2^n}-\frac{1}{2^n}\Big) - \sum_{\substack{2\le n\le m-1:\\ \omega_n=0}}\frac{x_n}{2^n}\Big)\\ &= \frac{2^{m-1}}{2^m-1}\Big(\frac{\eta(\omega)}{\alpha} + \frac{x_{m-1}}{2^{m-2}} - \frac{x_{m-1}}{2^{m-1}} + \frac{1}{2} + \sum_{\substack{2\le n\le m-1:\\ \omega_n=1}}\frac{x_n}{2^n} - \sum_{\substack{2\le n\le m-1:\\ \omega_n=0}}\frac{x_n}{2^n}\Big)\\ &= \frac{2^{m-1}}{2^m-1}\Big(\frac{\eta(\omega)}{\alpha} + \frac{x_{m-1}}{2^{m-1}} + \frac{1}{2} + \sum_{\substack{2\le n\le m-1:\\ \omega_n=1}}\frac{x_n}{2^n} - \sum_{\substack{2\le n\le m-1:\\ \omega_n=0}}\frac{x_n}{2^n}\Big).\end{aligned}$$

For any primitive block $\omega_1\cdots\omega_m$ ($m\ge 3$) and any $\alpha\in J_\omega$, the expression

$$K_\omega := \frac{x_{m-1}}{2^{m-1}} + \sum_{\substack{1\le n\le m-1:\\ \omega_n=1}}\frac{x_n}{2^n} - \sum_{\substack{1\le n\le m-1:\\ \omega_n=0}}\frac{x_n}{2^n}$$

has a constant value. As a result

$$\mu_\alpha\Big(\Big[-\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2}\Big]\Big) = \frac{2^{m-1}}{2^m-1}\Big(\frac{\eta(\omega)}{\alpha} + K_\omega\Big), \tag{17}$$

as a function of α on the interval J_ω, is increasing for $\eta(\omega)<0$, decreasing for $\eta(\omega)>0$, and a constant if $\eta(\omega)=0$.

Example 5.1. Let $n\ge 1$ and consider the primitive block $\omega = 1(10)^n11$ of odd length $m\ge 5$. Note that this is the lexicographically smallest primitive block of length m and that $\eta(\omega)=-1$. We have $-\frac{1}{\alpha} < \frac{1-x_m}{2^m-1} = \frac{-2x_{m-1}}{2^m-1}$. Moreover, $\frac{x_{2k+1}}{2^{2k+1}} = \frac{x_{2k}}{2^{2k}}$ for all $1\le k\le \frac{m}{2}-1$. Finally, $x_{m-1} = 2x_{m-2}+1$ and

$$x_{m-2} = 2^{m-3}+2^{m-4}+2^{m-6}+2^{m-8}+\cdots+2^3+2 = \frac{5}{3}2^{m-3} - \frac{2}{3}. \tag{18}$$

Then for all $\alpha \in J_{1(10)^n11}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu_\alpha\Big(\Big[-\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2}\Big]\Big) &= \frac{2^{m-1}}{2^m-1}\left(-\frac{1}{\alpha}+\frac{x_{m-1}}{2^{m-1}}+\frac{x_1}{2}+\frac{x_{m-1}}{2^{m-1}}\right)\\
&\le \frac{2^{m-1}}{2^m-1}\left(-\frac{2x_{m-1}}{2^m-1}+\frac{1}{2}+\frac{x_{m-1}}{2^{m-2}}\right)\\
&= \frac{2^{m-1}}{2^m-1}\frac{(2^{m-1}-1)x_{m-1}+2^{m-3}(2^m-1)}{2^{m-2}(2^m-1)}\\
&= \frac{2}{(2^m-1)^2}\left((2^{m-1}-1)\Big(\frac{5}{3}2^{m-2}-\frac{1}{3}\Big)+2^{m-3}(2^m-1)\right)\\
&= \frac{2}{3}\frac{1}{(2^m-1)^2}\big((2^{m-1}-1)(2^m+2^{m-2}-1)+(2^{m-2}+2^{m-3})(2^m-1)\big)\\
&= \frac{2}{3}\cdot\frac{2^{2m}-2^{m+1}-2^{m-3}+1}{(2^m-1)^2}<\frac{2}{3}.
\end{aligned}$$

Example 5.2. Let $n \ge 1$ and consider the primitive block $\omega = 1(10)^n1 = 11(01)^n$ of even length $m \ge 4$. Note that this is the lexicographically smallest primitive block of length m. Also note that $\eta(\omega) = 0$ and that $\frac{x_{2k+1}}{2^{2k+1}} = \frac{x_{2k}}{2^{2k}}$ for all $1 \le k \le \frac{m}{2}-2$. Using (18) we get $x_{m-1} = \frac{5}{3}2^{m-2} - \frac{2}{3}$. This gives that for all $\alpha \in J_{1(10)^n1}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu_\alpha\Big(\Big[-\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2}\Big]\Big) &= \frac{2^{m-1}}{2^m-1}\left(\frac{x_{m-1}}{2^{m-1}}+\frac{x_1}{2}\right)\\
&= \frac{2^{m-1}}{2^m-1}\Big(\frac{5}{3}\frac{1}{2}-\frac{2}{3}\frac{1}{2^{m-1}}+\frac{1}{2}\Big)\\
&= \frac{2}{3}\frac{1}{2^m-1}\Big(2-\frac{1}{2^{m-1}}\Big)=\frac{2}{3}.
\end{aligned}$$

The following theorem gives a large interval of α's on which the measure of the interval $\big[-\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2}\big]$ equals $\frac{2}{3}$.

Theorem 5.2. *$\mu_\alpha\big(\big[-\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2}\big]\big) = \frac{2}{3}$ for any $\alpha \in \big[\frac{6}{5},\frac{3}{2}\big]$.*

The proof of the theorem uses the following lemma.

Lemma 5.1. *Let ω be a primitive block. Then $\eta(\psi^n(\omega)) = 0$ for all $n \ge 1$. Moreover, $\alpha \mapsto \mu_\alpha\big(\big[-\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2}\big]\big)$ is constant on the interval $\big[p_\omega, L(\omega)\big]$.*

Proof. Let $\omega = \omega_1\cdots\omega_m$ be a primitive block and let k denote the number of 0's that occur in ω. Then $\eta(\omega) = k - (m-2-k) = 2k+2-m$. Since $\omega_m = 1$ and $1-\omega_1 = 0$, the number of 0's in $\psi(\omega)$ is $k+1+(m-2-k) = m-1$. Hence, $\eta(\psi(\omega)) = 0$ by the same reasoning $\eta(\psi^n(\omega)) = 0$ for all n. By (17) $\mu_\alpha\big(\big[-\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2}\big]\big)$ is constant on the interval $J_{\psi^n(\omega)}$. By Corollary 5.1, we have that

$$\mu_{L(\psi^n(\omega))}\Big(\Big[-\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2}\Big]\Big) = \mu_\alpha\Big(\Big[-\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2}\Big]\Big)$$

for all $\alpha \in I_{\psi^n(\omega)}$ and all $\alpha \in I_{\psi^{n+1}(\omega)}$. Hence, by continuity

$$\mu_\alpha\Big(\Big[-\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2}\Big]\Big) = \mu_{L(\omega)}\Big(\Big[-\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2}\Big]\Big)$$

for all $\alpha \in \big[p_\omega, L(\omega)\big]$. □

We have already proved that $\mu_\alpha\big(\big[-\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2}\big]\big) = \frac{2}{3}$ for any $\alpha \in I_{11} = \big[\frac{5}{4},\frac{3}{2}\big]$. By the above lemma, we can extend this to $\mu_\alpha\big(\big[-\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2}\big]\big) = \frac{2}{3}$ for any $\alpha \in \big[\frac{1}{2p^*},\frac{3}{2}\big]$, see (15). Theorem 5.2 says that we can extend this even further. As we have already seen in Section 2.1, for $\alpha = \frac{6}{5}$ there is no matching and $d_{6/5} = 1(10)^\infty$. Then by Lemma 2.1 any $\alpha \in \big(\frac{6}{5},\frac{1}{2p^*}\big)$ satisfies

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\psi^n(11) \prec d_\alpha \prec 11(01)^\infty. \tag{19}$$

In the proof of Theorem 5.2 we consider any primitive block ω satisfying this condition and we prove that the theorem holds on the corresponding intervals J_ω. We need the following lemma.

Lemma 5.2. *Let ω be a primitive block satisfying (19). Then*

$$\omega = 11(01)^{k_1}00(10)^{k_2}11(01)^{k_3}00(10)^{k_4}\cdots 00(10)^{k_{2n}}11(01)^{k_{2n+1}},$$

where $k_j \geq 0$ for any j. Hence $\eta(\omega) = 0$.

Proof. Obviously, $\omega_1\omega_2\omega_3\omega_4 = 1101$. This implies that the block 111 cannot occur in ω by Definition 3.1(ii). Moreover, ω can not contain the block 000 either, since this contradicts Definition 3.1(iii).

Next we claim that the blocks 00 and 11 in ω alternate, i.e., ω cannot contain any block of the form $11(01)^n1$ or $00(10)^n0$. The first one is obvious, since this contradicts the condition that $\omega \prec 11(01)^\infty$. For the second block, note that if

$$\omega = 11(01)^{k_1}00(10)^{k_2}11(01)^{k_3}00(10)^{k_4}\cdots 11(01)^{k_{2n-1}}00(10)^{k_{2n}}0\cdots$$

for some non-negative integers k_j, then

$$11(01)^{k_1}00(10)^{k_2}\cdots 11(01)^{k_{2n-1}} \prec \omega \prec \psi\big(11(01)^{k_1}00(10)^{k_2}\cdots 11(01)^{k_{2n-1}}\big),$$

which also contradicts the primitivity of ω.

Lastly, $\omega \neq 11(01)^{k_1}00(10)^{k_2}11(01)^{k_3}00(10)^{k_4}\cdots 00(10)^{k_{2n}}1$, since this would again give

$$11(01)^{k_1}00(10)^{k_2}\cdots 11(01)^{k_{2n-1}} \prec \omega \prec \psi(11(01)^{k_1}00(10)^{k_2}\cdots 11(01)^{k_{2n-1}}).$$

This gives the lemma. □

Proof of Theorem 5.2. To prove the theorem, we first closely examine K_ω for a primitive block ω of the form given in Lemma 5.2. Consider the summations $\sum_{\substack{1\leq n\leq m-1:\\ \omega_n=1}} \frac{x_n}{2^n} - \sum_{\substack{1\leq n\leq m-1:\\ \omega_n=0}} \frac{x_n}{2^n}$. Note that if $\omega_n = 1$ and $\omega_{n+1} = 0$, then $\frac{x_n}{2^n} - \frac{x_{n+1}}{2^{n+1}} = 0$ and that if $\omega_n = 0$ and $\omega_{n+1} = 1$, then $-\frac{x_n}{2^n} + \frac{x_{n+1}}{2^{n+1}} = \frac{1}{2^{n+1}}$. Writing

$$\omega = 1(10)^{k_1}10(01)^{k_2}01(10)^{k_3}10(01)^{k_4}01\cdots 10(01)^{k_{2n}}01(10)^{k_{2n+1}}1,$$

this gives the following expression:

$$\begin{aligned} K_\omega \;=\; & \frac{x_{m-1}}{2^{m-1}} + \frac{x_1}{2} + \sum_{j=1}^{k_2+1} \frac{1}{2^{1+2(k_1+1)+2j}} + \sum_{j=1}^{k_4+1} \frac{1}{2^{1+2(k_1+1)+2(k_2+2)+2(k_3+2)+2j}} \\ & + \cdots + \sum_{j=1}^{k_{2n}+1} \frac{1}{2^{1+2(k_1+1)+\cdots+2(k_{2n-1}+1)+2j}}. \end{aligned}$$

From Lemma 5.2 it follows that ω has even length, so there is an m, such that we can write $\omega' = 11(01)^m$ as

$$\omega' = 11(01)^{k_1}01(01)^{k_2}01(01)^{k_3}01(01)^{k_4}\cdots 01(01)^{k_{2n}}01(01)^{k_{2n+1}}.$$

If we write $x'_n = 2^n \bullet \omega'_1 \cdots \omega'_n$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{x'_{m-1} - x_{m-1}}{2^{m-1}} &= \sum_{j=1}^{k_2+1} \Big(\frac{1}{2^{2+2k_1+2j}} - \frac{1}{2^{2+2k_1+2j+1}} \Big) \\
&\quad + \sum_{j=1}^{k_4+1} \Big(\frac{1}{2^{2+2k_1+2+2k_2+2+2k_3+2j}} - \frac{1}{2^{2+2k_1+2+2k_2+2+2k_3+2j+1}} \Big) \\
&\quad + \cdots + \sum_{j=1}^{k_{2n}+1} \Big(\frac{1}{2^{2+2k_1+\cdots+2+2k_{2n-1}+2j}} - \frac{1}{2^{2+2k_1+\cdots+2+2k_{2n-1}+2j+1}} \Big) \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^{k_2+1} \frac{1}{2^{1+2(k_1+1)+2j}} + \sum_{j=1}^{k_4+1} \frac{1}{2^{1+2(k_1+1)+2(k_2+1)+2(k_3+1)+2j}} \\
&\quad + \cdots + \sum_{j=1}^{k_{2n}+1} \frac{1}{2^{1+2(k_1+1)+\cdots+2(k_{2n-1}+1)+2j}} \\
&= K_\omega - \frac{x_{m-1}}{2^{m-1}} - \frac{1}{2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Then by the previous lemma we have for any $\alpha \in I_\omega$ that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu_\alpha\Big(\Big[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\Big]\Big) = \frac{2^{m-1}}{2^m - 1} K_\omega &= \frac{2^{m-1}}{2^m - 1} \left(\frac{x'_{m-1} - x_{m-1}}{2^{m-1}} + \frac{x_{m-1}}{2^{m-1}} + \frac{1}{2} \right) \\
&= \frac{2^{m-1}}{2^m - 1} \Big(\frac{x'_{m-1}}{2^{m-1}} + \frac{1}{2} \Big) = \frac{2}{3},
\end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from Example 5.2. The result now follows from Corollary 5.1 and the structure of the intervals J_ω corresponding to primitive blocks ω. □

Final Remark: We believe, and a Mathematica program supports this, that the maximum value of $\mu_\alpha\big(\big[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\big]\big) = \frac{2}{3}$, and this is achieved only on the interval $\big[\frac{6}{5}, \frac{3}{2}\big]$. There seems to be a relation between the lexicographical ordering of sequences d_α and the measure $\mu_\alpha\big(\big[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\big]\big) = \frac{2}{3}$. Typically it seems to hold that if $\omega, \omega' \in \{0,1\}^m$ are two primitive blocks of the same length with $\omega \prec \omega'$, then for any $\alpha \in J_\omega$ and any $\alpha' \in J_{\omega'}$ we have

$$\mu_\alpha\Big(\Big[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\Big]\Big) \geq \mu_{\alpha'}\Big(\Big[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\Big]\Big).$$

There are exceptions to this rule however, as for example blocks ω of the form

$$\omega = 1^\ell(\underbrace{0 \ldots 0}_{\ell-1 \text{ times}} 1)^n$$

for some $\ell \geq 3$ and $n \geq 2$. We were not able to recover the general principle and prove the claim above.

Appendix

In this section we explain how we derived the formula for the invariant density (3) from results from [Kop90].

The results from [Kop90] apply to maps $F : [0,1] \to [0,1]$ that have $F(0), F(1) \in \{0,1\}$. Let the map $F : [0,1] \to [0,1]$ and the extended version of S_α, $\bar{S}_\alpha : [-\alpha, \alpha] \to [-\alpha, \alpha]$, be given by

$$F(x) = \begin{cases} 2x, & \text{if } x \in \big[0, \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{4\alpha}\big), \\ 2x - \frac{1}{2}, & \text{if } x \in \big[\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{4\alpha}, \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{4\alpha}\big], \\ 2x - 1, & \text{if } x \in \big(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{4\alpha}, 1\big], \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{S}_\alpha(x) = \begin{cases} 2x + \alpha, & \text{if } x \in \big[-\alpha, -\frac{1}{2}\big), \\ 2x, & \text{if } x \in \big[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\big], \\ 2x - \alpha, & \text{if } x \in \big(\frac{1}{2}, \alpha\big]. \end{cases}$$

Then F is conjugate to $\bar{S}_\alpha$ with conjugacy $\phi : [-\alpha, \alpha] \to [0,1]$, $x \mapsto \frac{x}{2\alpha} + \frac{1}{2}$. The critical points of F are $\phi\big(\frac{1}{2}\big) = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{4\alpha}$ and $\phi\big(-\frac{1}{2}\big) = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{4\alpha}$. We will calculate the invariant density for F.

For F we have $F(1-x) = -1 - F(x)$. Now, using the notation from [Kop90], define the points a_1, a_2, b_1 and b_2, by

$$a_1 = 2\Big(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{4\alpha}\Big) = 1 - \frac{1}{2\alpha}, \qquad b_1 = 2\Big(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{4\alpha}\Big) - \frac{1}{2} = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2\alpha},$$
$$a_2 = 2\Big(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{4\alpha}\Big) - \frac{1}{2} = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2\alpha} = 1 - b_1, \qquad b_2 = 2\Big(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{4\alpha}\Big) - 1 = \frac{1}{2\alpha} = 1 - a_1.$$

These are the images of the critical points. The critical points divide the unit interval into three pieces, called I_1, I_2 and I_3 in [Kop90], so $I_1 = \big[0, \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{4\alpha}\big)$, $I_2 = \big[\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{4\alpha}, \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{4\alpha}\big] = 1 - I_2$ and $I_3 = \big(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{4\alpha}, 1\big] = 1 - I_1$. Define

$$KI_n(y) = \sum_{t \geq 0} \frac{1}{2^{t+1}} 1_{I_n}(F^t(y)).$$

Then

$$KI_1(a_1) = KI_3(b_2), \quad KI_2(a_1) = KI_2(b_2), \quad KI_3(a_1) = KI_1(b_2),$$
$$KI_1(a_2) = KI_3(b_1), \quad KI_2(a_2) = KI_2(b_1), \quad KI_3(a_2) = KI_1(b_1).$$

Now define a 3×2 matrix $M = (\mu_{i,j})$ with entries

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu_{1,1} &= \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2}KI_1(a_1) - \frac{1}{2}KI_1(b_1) = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2}KI_3(a_2) - \frac{1}{2}KI_3(b_2) = -\mu_{3,2}, \\
\mu_{2,1} &= -\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2}KI_2(a_1) - \frac{1}{2}KI_2(b_1) = -\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2}KI_2(b_2) - \frac{1}{2}KI_2(a_2) = -\mu_{2,2}, \\
\mu_{3,1} &= \frac{1}{2}KI_3(a_1) - \frac{1}{2}KI_3(b_1) = \frac{1}{2}KI_1(b_2) - \frac{1}{2}KI_1(a_2) = -\mu_{1,2}.
\end{aligned}$$

So the matrix M has the following form:

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} a & -c \\ b & -b \\ c & -a \end{pmatrix}.$$

[Kop90, Lemma 1] gives us two other relations: For each y,

$$\frac{1}{2}KI_2(y) + KI_3(y) = y \quad \text{and} \quad KI_1(y) + KI_2(y) + KI_3(y) = 1. \tag{20}$$

From (20) we can derive the following two relations. For $j = 1, 2$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{2}\mu_{2,j} + \mu_{3,j} &= -\frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{4}KI_2(a_j) - \frac{1}{4}KI_2(b_j) + \frac{1}{2}KI_3(a_j) - \frac{1}{2}KI_3(b_j) \qquad (21) \\
&= -\frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{2}a_j - \frac{1}{2}b_j = 0, \\
\mu_{1,j} + \mu_{2,j} + \mu_{3,j} &= 0. \qquad (22)
\end{aligned}$$

From (21) we get that $a = c = -\frac{b}{2}$, so the matrix M becomes

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{b}{2} & \frac{b}{2} \\ b & -b \\ -\frac{b}{2} & \frac{b}{2} \end{pmatrix}.$$

There is a one-to-one correspondence between the solutions of the equation $M \cdot \gamma = 0$ and the space of invariant measures. Since S_α has a unique absolutely continuous invariant probability measure, M has at least one non-zero entry. Any vector γ such that $M \cdot \gamma = 0$ satisfies $\gamma_1 = \gamma_2$.

According to [Kop90, Theorem 1] a density of the invariant measures for F is given by

$$\begin{aligned} h(x) &= \frac{1}{2}\left(1_{[0,a_1)}(x) - 1_{[0,b_1)}(x) + \sum_{n\geq 0}\frac{1}{2^{n+1}}(1_{[0,F^{n+1}a_1)}(x) - 1_{[0,F^{n+1}b_1)}(x))\right) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2}\left(1_{[0,a_2)}(x) - 1_{[0,b_2)}(x) + \sum_{n\geq 0}\frac{1}{2^{n+1}}(1_{[0,F^{n+1}a_2)}(x) - 1_{[0,F^{n+1}b_2)}(x))\right) \\ &= \sum_{n\geq 0}\frac{1}{2^{n+1}}\Big(1_{[0,F^n a_1)}(x) - 1_{[0,F^n b_1)}(x) + 1_{[0,F^n a_2)}(x) - 1_{[0,F^n b_2)}(x)\Big) \\ &= \sum_{n\geq 0}\frac{1}{2^{n+1}}\Big(1_{[F^n b_1,F^n a_1)}(x) - 1_{[F^n a_1,F^n b_1)}(x) + 1_{[F^n b_2,F^n a_2)}(x) - 1_{[F^n a_2,F^n b_2)}(x)\Big). \end{aligned}$$

When translated back to the map S_α, this gives the formula from (3).

References

[AC83] J.-P. Allouche and M. Cosnard. Itérations de fonctions unimodales et suites engendrées par automates. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math.*, 296(3):159–162, 1983.

[AC01] J.-P. Allouche and M. Cosnard. Non-integer bases, iteration of continuous real maps, and an arithmetic self-similar set. *Acta Math. Hungar.*, 91(4):325–332, 2001.

[AOT06] J. Alves, K. Oliveira, and A. Tahzibi. On the continuity of the SRB entropy for endomorphisms. *J. Stat. Phys.*, 123(4):763–785, 2006.

[BCIT13] C. Bonanno, C. Carminati, S. Isola, and G. Tiozzo. Dynamics of continued fractions and kneading sequences of unimodal maps. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, 33(4):1313–1332, 2013.

[BCK17] H. Bruin, C. Carminati, and C. Kalle. Matching for generalised β-transformations. *Indag. Math. (N.S.)*, 28(1):55–73, 2017.

[BCMP] H. Bruin, C. Carminati, S. Marmi, and A. Profeti. Matching in a family of discontinuous interval maps. In preparation.

[BSORG13] V. Botella-Soler, J. A. Oteo, J. Ros, and P. Glendinning. Lyapunov exponent and topological entropy plateaus in piecewise linear maps. *J. Phys. A*, 46(12):125101, 26, 2013.

[CM] D. Cosper and M. Misiurewicz. Entropy locking. In preparation.

[CMPT10] C. Carminati, S. Marmi, A. Profeti, and G. Tiozzo. The entropy of α-continued fractions: numerical results. *Nonlinearity*, 23(10):2429–2456, 2010.

[CT12] C. Carminati and G. Tiozzo. A canonical thickening of $\mathbb{Q}$ and the entropy of α-continued fraction transformations. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, 32(4):1249–1269, 2012.

[CT13] C. Carminati and G. Tiozzo. Tuning and plateaux for the entropy of α-continued fractions. *Nonlinearity*, 26(4):1049–1070, 2013.

[Dek77] M. Dekking. Transcendance du nombre de Thue-Morse. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. A-B*, 285(4):A157–A160, 1977.

[DKL06] K. Dajani, C. Kraaikamp, and P. Liardet. Ergodic properties of signed binary expansions. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, 15(1):87–119, 2006.

[DKS09] K. Dajani, C. Kraaikamp, and W. Steiner. Metrical theory for α-Rosen fractions. *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)*, 11(6):1259–1283, 2009.

[dVK09] M. de Vries and V. Komornik. Unique expansions of real numbers. *Adv. Math.*, 221(2):390–427, 2009.

[EJK90] P. Erdös, I. Joó, and V. Komornik. Characterization of the unique expansions $1 = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} q^{-n_i}$ and related problems. *Bull. Soc. Math. France*, 118(3):377–390, 1990.

[HM07] C. Heuberger and J. Muir. Minimal weight and colexicographically minimal integer representations. *J. Math. Cryptol.*, 1(4):297–328, 2007.

[HP06] C. Heuberger and H. Prodinger. Analysis of alternative digit sets for nonadjacent representations. *Monatsh. Math.*, 147:219248, 2006.

[KL98] V. Komornik and P. Loreti. Unique developments in non-integer bases. *Amer. Math. Monthly*, 105(7):636–639, 1998.

[KL07] V. Komornik and P. Loreti. On the topological structure of univoque sets. *J. Number Theory*, 122(1):157–183, 2007.

[Kop90] C. Kopf. Invariant measures for piecewise linear transformations of the interval. *Appl. Math. Comput.*, 39(2, part II):123–144, 1990.

[KSS12] C. Kraaikamp, T. Schmidt, and W. Steiner. Natural extensions and entropy of α-continued fractions. *Nonlinearity*, 25(8):2207–2243, 2012.

[LK97] C. Laih and W. Kuo. Speeding up the computations of elliptic curves cryptoschemes. *Comput. Math. Appl.*, 33(5):29–36, 1997.

[LM08] L. Luzzi and S. Marmi. On the entropy of Japanese continued fractions. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, 20(3):673–711, 2008.

[MO90] F. Morain and J. Olivos. Speeding up the computations on an elliptic curve using addition-subtraction chains. *RAIRO Inform. Théor. Appl.*, 24(6):531–543, 1990.

[NN08] H. Nakada and R. Natsui. The non-monotonicity of the entropy of α-continued fraction transformations. *Nonlinearity*, 21(6):1207–1225, 2008.

[Par60] W. Parry. On the β-expansions of real numbers. *Acta Math. Acad. Sci. Hungar.*, 11:401–416, 1960.

[Via] M. Viana. Stochastic dynamics of deterministic systems. Lecture notes.

[Zak03] S. Zakeri. External rays and the real slice of the Mandelbrot set. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, 23(2):637–660, 2003.

(Karma Dajani) Department of Mathematics, Utrecht University, P.O. Box 80010, 3508TA Utrecht, the Netherlands

E-mail address, Karma Dajani: k.dajani1@uu.nl

(Charlene Kalle) Mathematisch Instituut, Leiden University, Niels Bohrweg 1, 2333CA Leiden, The Netherlands

E-mail address, Charlene Kalle: kallecccj@math.leidenuniv.nl